

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 19, 1862.

ON TUESDAY LAST, the first day of term, the Lord Chancellor received the Judges, Queen's Counsel, and other legal dignitaries at breakfast at his private residence in Belgrave-square. His Lordship afterwards proceeded to Westminster and took his seat in court. He was accompanied by the Master of the Rolls, Lord Justice Turner, and Vice-Chancellors Kindersley, Stuart, and Wood. M. Chaix d'Este Ange, Procureur-Imperial of France, was also present and occupied a seat on the bench during the sitting of the Court. M. Chaix d'Este Ange also visited the Court of Queen's Bench. He was announced by the Lord Chief Justice, and was introduced by the Attorney-General, and took a seat within the bar, where he remained for some time, and apparently took great interest in the proceedings.

THE COURTS OF EQUITY and of Common Law commenced their sittings for Easter Term on Tuesday last. The number of appeals, causes, and other matters set down for hearing before the equity judges is as follows:—

Before the Lord Chancellor } and Lords Justices }	Appeals	12
„ The Master of the Rolls . . .	Causes, &c.	89
„ Vice-Chancellor Kindersley . . .	„	40
„ Vice-Chancellor Stuart . . .	„	68
„ Vice-Chancellor Wood . . .	„	112

The cause list of the Court of Queen's Bench shows an entry of 26 remanets and 33 new causes, one of which is for a special jury. The list of the Court of Common Pleas has one remanet and 22 new causes, five of which are special jury causes. The list of the Court of Exchequer has three remanets set down for trial and 38 new causes, four of which are special juries. The following days have been appointed for hearing errors from the different courts:—From the Court of Queen's Bench, Wednesday, May 14, and Thursday, 15; from the Court of Common Pleas, Friday, May 16; and from the Court of Exchequer, Saturday, May 17, and Monday and Tuesday, May 19 and 20. The Court of Probate and Divorce sat for the first time this term on Wednesday, and from an analysis of the printed list it appears that there are 99 divorce and matrimonial petitions set down for hearing, which include 11 cases for judicial separation, 87 for dissolution of marriage, and one for declaration of legitimacy, showing a decrease as compared with the three preceding terms. Of these 7 are to be tried by special juries and 15 by common juries, while the remainder are to be heard by the Court without juries. There are 14 probate cases, 6 of which are to be heard by a special jury, 4 by a common jury, and the remaining 4 by the Court without juries.

BY THE 6TH SECTION of the Act for the More Effectual Administration of Justice in England and Wales (1 Will. 4. c. 70), it is provided “that if the whole or any number of the days intervening between the Thursday before, and the Wednesday next after, Easter Day, shall fall within Easter Term, there shall be no sittings in banco on any of such intervening days, but the term shall in such case be prolonged, and continue for such number of days of business as shall be equal to the number of the intervening days before mentioned, exclusive of Easter day, and the commencement of the ensuing Trinity Term shall in such case be postponed, and its continuance prolonged for an equal number of days of business.” In accordance with this provision the courts of common law will not sit in banc at West-

minster this day nor on Monday and Tuesday next. Notices have also been issued that the offices of the several courts will be closed on those days.

THE PRESENT TERM embraces a period of twenty-nine days, instead of twenty-four, arising from the circumstance of the feast of Easter falling late in the year. Last year the term ended on the 8th of May; and the now ensuing term (always commencing on the 15th of April) terminates on the 13th of May. The extra five days are added on account of the closing of the law offices, from Thursday last, for five days. The fact seems to have escaped notice in some quarters.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE of the House of Lords did not make much alteration in the bills relating to the transfer of land which were referred to them. They struck out of the Lord Chancellor's Transfer of Land Bill the “Insurance” clause which provided compensation out of the Consolidated Fund for any claimant making good a claim after some person has obtained registration of his title as indefeasible. From Lord Cranworth's two bills, which provide a scheme for declaration of title by the Court of Chancery, and for a registration by endorsement, the committee altogether excluded copyholds, and struck out a clause which empowered the Lord Chancellor to appoint conveyancing counsel to act exclusively in the proceedings under this scheme. All these bills, amended in these and some less important particulars, together with the bill of Lord St. Leonards for shortening the time within which a *bond fide* purchaser may be liable to an outstanding claim, the committee sent back to the House, but reported that it was not expedient to proceed with Lord Chelmsford's bills—the bills formerly proposed by Sir H. Cairns.

ANOTHER QUARTER HAS PASSED and no steps have been taken to provide for the officers of the Insolvent Debtors Court the full amount of the incomes which they enjoyed before the passing of the Bankruptcy Act, and which were supposed to be secured to them by that statute. The bare salaries alone have been paid, and the business from which the remainder of their incomes proceeded has been transferred to the Court of Bankruptcy, as have also the officers themselves, but the funds of that court, although ample to remunerate new officers at high salaries, are not sufficient to meet the claims of those who have laboured in the public service for lengthened periods, in some cases exceeding forty years.

A PARLIAMENTARY RETURN, which was moved for by Mr. Gregson, has just been printed, which furnishes some important information with regard to the working of the law of limited liability. From this it appears that in the period since the issue of the previous return—namely, from the 1st of August, 1859, to the 31st of December, 1861, the number of companies formed upon that principle was 901 in England, 56 in Ireland, and 41 in Scotland, and that at the date of the present return the whole of these, with the exception of 79 which had been abandoned, dissolved, or wound-up, were still in operation. A striking point in connection with the English companies is that about three-fourths of the entire number are county or town undertakings, formed in numerous instances for purposes of local usefulness, only about one-fourth having had their origin in London. Many of these have capitals as low as from £1,000 to £5,000, and the average is about £20,000. The aggregate number of limited liability companies started in the United Kingdom since the introduction of that law seems to have been 2,099, of which up to the 31st of December last 308 had ceased to exist.

A CORRESPONDENT OF A MORNING JOURNAL, writing recently on the subject of prosecutions expenses, says “the result of only allowing the prosecutor two guineas for his attorney's fees for conducting a prosecution, with no travelling expenses, even if he has to travel thirty

miles to the assize town, is this—that no respectable attorney will undertake the conducting of a prosecution, and the consequence is that briefs for prosecutions are prepared by the magistrates' clerks, and put into the hands of a police-constable to deliver to counsel, and to act in every respect as his clerk, which he does. I would here ask if it be lawful for the committing magistrate's clerk to act as the attorney for the prosecutor. If it be, the sooner the law is altered the better; for at present it is to the clerk's advantage that every prisoner should be committed for trial, that he may get a job to prosecute him."

THE COMPENSATION ANNUITIES payable to proctors and other officers of the late Ecclesiastical and Prerogative Courts amounted to £115,987 at the beginning of last year, and at the end of it they had only fallen to £114,772; for, though persons entitled to compensations amounting to £4,152 died in the course of the year, all the pensions exceeding £500 reverted to successors. But for the pensions the Probate Courts would be self-supporting, for the deficiency in the year for all these courts, both in England and Ireland, was but £129,052, and this included an extraordinary expenditure by the Board of Works, in all above £28,000 in that department. The fees received in 1861 amounted to £120,385, and the salaries and expenses (including this £28,000) were £134,665, to which must be added the £114,722 for compensations.

IT APPEARS TO BE PROBABLE that "the Chancery Funds Commission," which was appointed in February, 1861, will not be able to complete its labours before the end of the present year. A sub-committee had been appointed to consider a scheme relating to one branch of the inquiry, and in connection with which a large amount of documentary evidence had been collected, the consideration of which will occupy the committee for a very long period of time.

THE SITTINGS OF THE INSOLVENT DEBTORS COURT are drawing to a close; and unless the Lord Chancellor should relieve the crowded state of the Courts in Basinghall-street (of which daily complaints are loudly made) by an order sending a part of the cases to Portugal-street, with one of the commissioners, the doors will be closed in the early part of May. A staff of officers must remain, and one of the Courts could be used for the benefit of the public, and thus the inconveniences and unpleasantness experienced at the Bankruptcy Court might be considerably alleviated.

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, on Tuesday the following attorneys were ordered to be struck off the Rolls of the Court—viz. William Henry Knight Cross, convicted of obtaining money under false pretences; Henry Hart, convicted of perjury; and James Shaw, convicted of forgery.

THE VOTES ON THE CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES will comprise a sum of £1,500 for the Irish Law Courts Commission, and £2,037 for the West India Incumbered Estates Commission. The latter sum is a large increase on former votes for the same purpose.

MR. W. ELMSLEY, Q.C., of the Chancery Bar, has been appointed judge of the County Court of Derbyshire (Circuit No. 19), vacant by the death of Mr. J. T. Cantrell. This is one of the best appointments ever made to the County Court bench. Mr. Elmsley is well known at Lincoln's-inn as a sound and accomplished lawyer. For very many years he had a large business as a chancery junior. The only fault that can be found with his appointment is that he is far too good a man for the place, as he is certainly qualified for the discharge of higher judicial functions than he will be called upon to perform in Derbyshire. Mr. Elmsley was one of the Queen's Counsel in the Vice-Chancellor

Stuart's court, and his promotion (if it can be so called) has made a vacancy in the front row of that Court, which it is said will be filled by Mr. W. A. Collins, Q.C.

MR. WALTER MORGAN, Mr. F. B. Kemp, Mr. W. S. Seton Karr, and Mr. L. S. Jackson, have been appointed judges of the High Court at Calcutta. Mr. Walter Morgan was formerly the Master in Equity of the Supreme Court of Calcutta, and some time since clerk to the Legislative Council. He was also one of the authors of the admirable edition of the Indian Penal Code, which was published last year.

MR. CHAPMAN, who was for many years a judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand, and who formerly filled the office of Attorney-General at Melbourne, Australia, has been appointed judge of the Supreme Court in Melbourne during the absence of Sir Redmond Barry, who is now in this country.

MR. MONTAGU BERE, of the Western Circuit, has been appointed Recorder of Southampton, vacant by the resignation of Mr. W. Major Cooke, on his appointment as one of the magistrates of Worship-street Police Court.

MR. W. M. HINDMARCH, Q.C., has been elected a Bencher of the Hon. Society of Gray's Inn.

MR. MONTAGUE CHAMBERS, Q.C., Mr. J. Hinde Palmer, Q.C., and Mr. F. Goldsmid, brother of Sir Francis Goldsmid, Q.C., are amongst those named as likely to become candidates for the representation of Lambeth, in the room of Mr. Roupell, who has resigned.

MR. C. MARK DE JOUX has been appointed Secretary to the Council and Registrar of the Land Court for the Island of Mauritius. Mr. J. T. F. Callaghan, who was administrator of the Government of the Island of Labuan, has been appointed Governor and Commander-in-Chief of that Island. Little more than a year ago Mr. Callaghan was a very young junior at the Irish Bar. He was appointed Chief Magistrate at Hong Kong, and on his way to that colony was entrusted with the temporary administration of the government of Labuan. Speedy, but we believe well deserved, promotion has made him already its Governor and Commander-in-Chief—an encouragement to lawyers who are also enthusiastic volunteers.

IN CONSEQUENCE of the elevation of Mr. Phipson to the rank of Queen's Counsel, Mr. C. Pollock, Tubman of the Court, has been promoted to the office of Postman, Mr. Honyman succeeding Mr. Pollock as Tubman.

CONCENTRATION OF COURTS.

The Government Bills relating to the concentration of the courts and public law offices have been thrown out in the House of Commons by a majority of two, contrary to the expectations of most persons interested in the subject. We were not very much surprised, however, as we had not forgotten the extraordinary proceedings adopted by the Government last session in reference to the same measure. It is no wonder that the House of Commons should view the proposal of the Government with the utmost suspicion, after the extraordinary Treasury "Minute" which was issued at the close of last session, and was so much adverted to in the recent debate. A more strange and unwarrantable state of things in reference to any Government measure has never, perhaps, been known. The bills laid before the House of Commons last year and introduced again this session were not hasty productions of a subordinate department introduced without the knowledge or sanction of the Prime Minister or the Lord Chancellor. The whole

scheme was the result of many years of careful discussion and laborious preparation, and was, moreover, prepared in detail and unanimously recommended by a Royal Commission appointed to consider the question. The entire body of lawyers, and all persons whose experience qualify them to form an opinion on the subject, were strongly in favour of the principles of concentration. It has had no more strenuous advocate than the present Lord Chancellor. The Government professed to have adopted this principle, and also pronounced decidedly in favour of the particular scheme recommended by the Commissioners. Indeed, more than a year ago, as we at the time announced, Lord Palmerston himself, accompanied by the Attorney-General, then Sir Richard Bethell, and Sir W. Atherton, took the trouble one wet day to "beat the bounds" of the proposed site, and was seen trying to take an imaginary *coup d'œil* of the New Palace of Justice from the shelter of a doorway in Bell Yard. So earnest did the Government appear in the matter that not a moment was lost in giving all the necessary Parliamentary notices to the occupiers and other persons interested in the area of the intended site. The bills introduced last session were, moreover, pressed forward, and a select committee of the House of Commons had been appointed and had made its report in favour of the scheme, when, at the last moment, when the House was, in fact, to some extent pledged to the measure, and but a few days before the adjournment of Parliament, the Treasury issued a minute, the only effect of which could be to deter the House from passing the bills which ministers themselves had introduced. Mr. Cowper mentioned the other night that this manifesto was intended to be only "in the character of a warning as to what might ultimately and possibly be the expense that would be caused by the plan proposed." We should have thought that it was not only against precedent, but also contrary to common sense, that one department of the State should thus solemnly caution Parliament against the possible consequences of a measure introduced by another department with the full sanction of ministers. There seems to be no reason why the minister entrusted with the introduction of the bills should not have stated to the House all that was contained in the document issued from the Treasury. If he had done so, the suggestions of the unpleasant possibilities which it contained would have been far less alarming to Parliament, as a little explanation would have convinced it that the estimates of the Royal Commissioners on whose report the Government had framed its measure, would, in all probability, be amply adequate for its purposes, and that the calculations of the Treasury were purely conjectural and as incomplete as Mr. Cowper showed them to be in his recent speech. But the Government has paid the penalty for its imprudence. It supplied the opponents of the measure with their most effective weapon, and has therefore to thank itself for its own defeat. We can only hope that next session this important question will be handled in a different manner, and be treated more in accordance with its merits.

It is now a quarter of a century since the Incorporated Law Society invited public attention to the great advantages that would accrue from a concentration of the law courts and offices. Since then it has brought the question before almost every successive Government, and the mass of evidence in favour of the proposal relating to it, which was accumulated even before the appointment of the commission of 1839, was so overwhelming that there could be no doubt about the general scope of their report. The Commissioners divided their inquiry into three heads. 1. The expediency of concentration; 2. The selection of a site; 3. The necessary funds. Upon the first point the report states—"we have had no division of opinion, or difficulty in arriving at our conclusion." Indeed they say that the evidence was "all on one side;" and so far as its being merely a question for lawyers, they tell us that no class of persons was "actually so largely inter-

ested as the public itself." Upon the second question the Commissioners were in favour of the site between Bell-yard on the east and Clement's-inn on the west—which was also, as we have mentioned, sanctioned by the law officers of the Crown and the Government itself. The only difference of opinion arose about the source from which the funds were originally to be drawn. All the Commissioners, except Vice-Chancellor Wood, were of opinion that the large balances now standing to the credit of the Suitsors' Fund and the Suitsors' Fee Fund might be appropriated for the acquisition of a site and the erection of the new building, without any violation of the rights of property. Vice-Chancellor Wood, however, thought otherwise, and in this opinion he had the concurrence of Sir John Romilly, M.R. The objection of both these learned persons was that there was something in the nature of a right in chancery suitsors to have the funds in question devoted to the reduction of chancery fees, and that these moneys, therefore, could not be appropriated for the general purposes of the State without an infringement of such right. This objection, supported as it was by the authority of these two distinguished judges, was, of course, urged by the opponents of the measure in the recent debate; but it cannot be supposed that it had much weight in producing the surprising result of placing the Government in a minority of two. That misfortune is due simply to the unfortunate course which the Government adopted last session, and to the want of interest or timidity which was recently exhibited in a matter which did not admit of either, and for which the general voice as well as the true interests of the country required the hearty, earnest, and united support of the Government that had undertaken to become its advocates and sponsors.

The Courts.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

(Before the LORDS JUSTICES.)

April 16.—*Bonser v. Bradshaw*.—The object of this motion was to obtain a declaration from the Court that the costs incurred by a solicitor in recovering certain real estate on behalf of an infant was a first charge on such estate. It appeared that the mother of the infant being unable to provide the necessary funds for prosecuting the infant's claim, the solicitor had himself found them, and by means thereof carried on the cause of the infant, which he had taken up to a successful issue. The will under which the parties claimed was, after much litigation at law and in equity, declared to be a forgery, and the infant was declared entitled to the estate in question; but the defendants who were ordered to pay the costs had absconded. A small portion of the estate had been taken by a railway company, and the purchase-money which had been paid into court had been paid out to the solicitor in part payment of his costs; but there was a large sum still due, and the estate was the security fund to which the solicitor could look. It was admitted, on the authority of *Shaw v. Neale*, 20 Beav. 157, reversed on appeal, 6 H. L. Cas. 581, 6 W. R. 635, that the costs would not be a lien on the real estate, except for the statute 23 & 24 Vict., c. 127, s. 28, under the provisions of which the present application was made. The motion was originally made before and refused by Vice-Chancellor Stuart.

Lord Justice TURNER asked whether the solicitor could be said to have been "employed" by the infant within the meaning of the statute.

Lord Justice KNIGHT BRUCE observed that the infant and the solicitor clearly had distinct interests, and as no person had been served with notice of the present application, which was made by the solicitor on behalf of himself, the infant, and the infant's mother and next friend, the motion must stand over in order that it might come before the Court as a substantially opposed application; the applicant giving such notices as he might be advised to be necessary for that purpose. It was impossible to dispose of such an application on an *ex parte* motion.

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

(Before the LORD CHIEF BARON.)

April 16.—*Glendinning v. Thomas*.—Mr. Honyman showed cause against a rule which had been obtained by Mr. Laxton last term for an attachment against the defendant for contempt of Court in not appearing upon his subpoena. The learned counsel, in the course of his argument, observed that the subpoena was served upon the defendant not for the purpose of calling him, but as a dodge to get money out of him.

The LORD CHIEF BARON said there were several dictionaries in court, and he should be glad if the learned counsel could point out in any of them the word "dodge."

Mr. Honyman said he was sorry if he had used an improper expression.

The LORD CHIEF BARON said he hoped counsel would not think they could indulge in any licence of expression and language which was not used in the ordinary intercourse of gentlemen.

Mr. Honyman having further apologised for using the word, contended that there was not sufficient ground to justify the attachment.

ASSIZES.

OXFORD CIRCUIT.

GLOUCESTER.

(Before Mr. Justice CROMPTON and Common Juries.)

April 10.—*Poole v. Whitcombe*.—Mr. J. J. Powell and Mr. J. O. Griffiths appeared for the plaintiff; and Mr. Huddleston, Q.C., and Mr. H. James for the defendant.

This was an action brought by Esther Poole against her late master, Mr. H. S. Whitcombe, to recover damages for assaulting her, causing her boxes to be searched, and for turning her out of the house, and causing her to be placed in a cart and removed some distance.

During the progress of the case Mr. Justice CROMPTON intimated that there was no justification for taking the keys and searching the boxes, or for taking the plaintiff away in the cart.

Mr. Huddleston contended that, at the most, it was a case only for nominal damages.

Mr. Powell contended for substantial damages, and suggested that the defendant would be perfectly content if the jury gave a verdict for less than five guineas, to deprive the plaintiff of costs.

Mr. Justice CROMPTON interposed, and said counsel had no right to make such a suggestion, and it would be ground for a new trial if the jury acted upon it.

The learned JUDGE, in summing up, told the jury that they must give their verdict without reference to its effect upon the costs.

The jury found for the plaintiff, with five guineas damages.

Mr. Justice CROMPTON said that, of course, a motion would be made for a new trial.

Mr. Powell said Mr. Baron Bramwell was of opinion that a jury might be told what would carry costs.

Mr. Justice CROMPTON said he thought the jury ought not to be influenced by the question of costs.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner HOLROYD.)

April 8.—*Re Wake*.—*Rights of Parties under Trust Deeds*.—Mr. Reed referring to a decision of Mr. Commissioner Evans said that some doubt had arisen in consequence thereof as to whether that learned Commissioner had laid down the rule that, after the registration of a trust deed under section 192, *et seq.*, the Court of Bankruptcy itself was to be considered as directing every subsequent proceeding, as in bankruptcy, or whether the Court was a judicial tribunal to which any of the trustees, or other parties to a trust deed, or any creditor, could apply for assistance only in case of need. He now asked that the trustees in this matter should be allowed to compromise a debt; and also that the Court would appoint a meeting of creditors for a dividend, although the four months required by the Act of 1861, in reference to bankrupts, had not expired.

Mr. Commissioner HOLROYD, after consulting with Commissioners Evans, and Foulque, declined to make any order in the matter. It was not to be understood that Mr. Commissioner Evans had decided that the Court of Bankruptcy had any jurisdiction under trust deeds, except on the application of any proper party, to interpose its authority for the prevention

of fraud or manifest irregularity. In all other respects, the trustees must be deemed to be acting for the interests of those by whom they had been appointed, and the Court could only be considered as ancillary in case of need, to their proceedings.

April 14.—*In re Wilson*.—The bankrupt had carried on a small business at Watford. He applied to pass his examination and for his order of discharge.

Upon cross-examination the bankrupt said that he had come to that Court in consequence of being pressed by his creditors. He gave £14 to his solicitor. He had given up nothing to his creditors. His solicitor had rendered no account.

The COMMISSIONER said that no person was at liberty to receive money from a bankrupt in contemplation of bankruptcy. The money should be brought into court, and the solicitor should bring in his bill in the usual way. He would either dismiss the petition, or he would adjourn the case in order that the money might be paid into court.

The bankrupt having preferred an adjournment, Order accordingly.

Parliament and Legislation.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, April 10.

CHANCERY REGULATION BILL.

LORD KINGSDOWN, in moving the second reading of this bill, which had already passed through the House of Commons, alluded to the practice which had prevailed in the Court of Chancery of sending questions of fact to be tried by the common law courts. The present bill would make it obligatory on the Court of Chancery to decide questions of fact arising in the course of the suits brought before them. The measure would not give the Court of Chancery any new jurisdiction, but would compel them to avail themselves of powers which they might at present exercise at their discretion.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said that he entirely approved of the object of the bill. He believed it would be productive of a great deal of good if its obligatory character was carefully preserved. But he also thought that the alterations which had been made in its provisions in the course of its progress through the House of Commons would do much to defeat that object, and he hoped the measure might again be restored to a state which would render it certain that suitors would not be sent away from the Court of Chancery before they obtained the decision of any point with which it was competent to that Court to deal.

LORD KINGSDOWN said he agreed with his noble and learned friend that it would be better the alterations had not been made in the bill in the House of Commons. The fact was that they had only been assented to in that house in deference to the opinion of the Solicitor-General.

The bill was then read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, April 10.

COURTS OF JUSTICE MONEY BILL.

On the order of the day for the second reading of this bill, Sir W. HEATHCOTE asked for further explanations of the provisions of the measure.

Mr. COWPER, after giving a sketch of the bill, and stating the objects to be attained by it, and describing the inconveniences connected with the present position of the courts of law and equity, said, the bill empowered the expenditure of stock in the surplus interest fund and the surplus fee fund to the extent of £1,500,000, which would probably realise about £1,400,000. The money would be drawn from the surplus interest fund and the surplus fee fund, but Parliament, in the first place, would be called on to guarantee the money. Against the expenses of the new buildings there would have to be set the value of the disused courts in Chancery-lane, Southampton-buildings, Serjeant's-inn, the Probate Registry, and the sites of the common law courts at Westminster, where Sir Charles Barry always contemplated the erection of a row of handsome buildings; and the result would be, not a charge on the public, but a considerable saving. The present courts of common law cost £98,000. The new courts would probably

cost little less than £200,000. What the public were called on to do was, to give a guarantee that in the event of either of the funds being required the amount borrowed for the new courts should be supplied out of the Consolidated Fund. Nobody living had any claim to the funds in question. They were created in consequence of the passing of no less than ten Acts of the Legislature; and if it had not been for them the money would never have been invested, and would have been lying idle. The property, therefore, with which he now proposed to deal was the accumulation of the interest on those investments.

Mr. SELWYN complained that this bill would in reality occasion the country very heavy expense. He observed that the Treasury minute issued in 1861 by the hon. member for Lewes went only to the extent of a million and fifty pounds; and, considering the present condition of our finances the expenditure of a large sum like this in the absence of a surplus would be very distasteful to the country. With respect to the suitors' fee fund, so far from its increasing it was actually diminishing. In 1859 it was £300,000, according to the evidence of Mr. Johnstone, the solicitor to the fund; but on the 27th of November, 1860, it was reduced to £158,122, and in 1861 it had sunk to £156,901, being a decrease within that time of £1,221. The suitors' fee fund was the result entirely of taxation. Every step in Chancery was taxed. The bill was taxed, the answer was taxed, the evidence was taxed, and the decree was taxed. What would become of the surplus fund if the fees fell off? He contended that such was not improbable, in consequence partly of the odium which still attached to the Court of Chancery, and partly to the alterations which were constantly being made in the legal procedure of this country. The proposition before the House was that the fund which mainly depended on the taxation of one court should be applied to the benefit of the suitors of all the other courts. At present the fund was devoted to the improvement of the Court of Chancery, but no indemnity was to be given under the bill for that, and the fourth clause provided that no alterations or improvements were to be made in the Court of Chancery without the previous sanction of the Treasury. All he asked was that the Court of Chancery should be left alone. If it was right to concentrate the courts, let that be done; and he believed that so far from the rejection of this bill preventing that, it would facilitate it; for if they took away the six Courts of Chancery from the present proposal it would make the scheme a practicable one. The hon. and learned gentleman concluded by moving that the bill be read a second time on that day six months.

Mr. F. PEEL supported the bill. He believed the plan could be carried out without any considerable cost to the public, while it would be productive of great advantage; and he certainly knew no other mode in which so extensive and useful a work could be completed with so little pressure on the resources of the state.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said the Government had proceeded in the belief that this measure was one of the greatest possible value and importance with respect to the administration of the law, and they had therefore felt willing, and advised the House to exhibit the same willingness, to encounter some considerable risk with regard to the outside charge which might be entailed. He thought it was not possible to make much progress beyond the outline that had been given of the measure until the house went into committee on the bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said his hon. and learned friend who moved the rejection of this bill commenced by referring to the financial portion of the measure. After what had been said he would not go further into that matter than to make this observation: that his hon. and learned friend, in the figures which he stated to the house, omitted that which formed a distinct part of the statement of the hon. gentleman in moving the second reading of the bill—namely, the credits that he was entitled to set off against the expenditure, which credits amounted to £700,000. His hon. and learned friend having shortened the expenditure sought to diminish the public income for the future, and in so doing anticipated from the present course of legislation that the amount of business in the courts of equity would be considerably diminished. He (Sir W. Atherton) could not agree in that anticipation, but thought that with the increase of the wealth and commerce of the country the business of these courts would increase. The feeling of the legal profession was almost unanimous in favour of this measure, and believing this to be the case he hoped it would receive the assent of the house.

Mr. MALINS objected to the bill because it seemed to be an

attempt to hoodwink the house by concealing the fact that the public funds must pay for these courts.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL, after observing upon the great benefits which he thought the profession generally would derive from the concentration of the courts, said, he thought the whole subject might be considered before a select committee and that it should go before such a tribunal.

Mr. WALPOLE opposed the bill.

The SPEAKER then put the question that the bill be read a second time.

The House thereupon divided when the numbers were,

Ayes	81
Noes	81

The speaker was about to give his casting vote, when it was discovered that an hon. member, who would have voted with the ayes, had not passed into the lobby. The speaker thereupon again put the question when the numbers were,

For the second reading	81
Against it	83
Majority	—2

The bill was therefore lost.

TRADING COMPANIES.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL moved for leave to bring in a bill for the incorporation, regulation, and winding up of trading companies and other associations. He said it was proposed to consolidate seventeen Acts on these subjects, of which six related to joint stock companies, four to banking companies, and five to the winding up of companies. It was intended to repeal the whole of these Acts, except a small number of sections, which would be inserted in a schedule, so that for the future, if the bill passed, all trading companies would be brought under a simple statute as to their construction, regulation, and winding-up. Instead of the limited £100 formerly imposed, it was intended that there should be no limit to the amount of the shares of banking companies trading under limited liability. It was proposed also to limit the retrospective liability of past shareholders to one year from the date of the transfer of their shares; to limit it also to the case of contracts made before the transfer; and to make their liability a secondary one, not to be enforced until after that of the existing shareholders. It was further proposed that in all cases except that of mining companies subject to Stannary jurisdiction the winding up should take place in the Court of Bankruptcy, and the Vice-Warden of the Stannary Courts would be empowered to refer cases to the same Court. Another useful provision would be one by which every limited company would be bound to keep a register, accessible to shareholders and creditors, of all mortgages effected by the company.

Leave was given to introduce the bill.

JURIES.

On the motion of Mr. HUNT, leave was given to introduce a bill to give greater facilities for summoning persons to serve on juries.

PROSECUTION EXPENSES.

Mr. HUNT moved for a select committee to inquire into the operation of the present system of payment of the expenses of prosecutions, with reference to the due administration of justice, and to report to the House whether it is desirable that any alteration should be made in that system, either as to rates of payment or as to the fund out of which such payment should be made.

SIR G. GREY, in consenting to the motion, said that the expenses of prosecutions had become so heavy a charge on the Consolidated Fund that some check was necessary to prevent any further increase in the amount. Accordingly, in 1857 when he was Home Secretary, a new scale of allowances for witnesses, &c., was adopted, which he admitted had caused a great deal of dissatisfaction in many parts of the country. No evidence had been laid before the Government to show that there had been a failure of justice arising from the present scale; and he must observe that all witnesses had a right to expect was a fair compensation for their expenses and loss of time. No profit ought to be made by any person on account of his evidence in a court of justice. The right hon. gentleman read the following extracts from the report of the commission on the subject:—

"We find that the greatest differences prevail in the different parts of the country as to the charges usually allowed—differences for which we cannot account by any such satisfactory reason as might be afforded by the contrast between urban and rural districts, or between districts thinly inhabited and with-

out roads, and districts traversed by roads and railways. Nor, while it is alleged that failure of justice will be the necessary consequence of reduced allowances, do we find that in jurisdictions like those of Surrey, Kent, Hants, Somerset, and others in which the scale is low, crime escapes punishment from a reluctance either to prosecute or to give evidence."

"It will probably be objected that some of these allowances are too low by the counties in which larger allowances have heretofore prevailed, but we find that they exceed the allowance in the counties on the Oxford and Norfolk circuits, in some on the Western and Home circuits and several other places where no failure of justice has ever been alleged to exist. In point of fact, the scale of the Home-office was based on evidence derived from the counties."

Mr. DEEDES believed that the result of the inquiry now asked for would be to show that the recommendation of the Commissioners who had reported on this subject were sound.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH supported the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Friday, April 11.

THE INCOME TAX.

Mr. HUBBARD gave notice that he should, on the 13th of May, submit a motion on the income and property tax.

Recent Decisions.

EQUITY.

LOCKE KING'S ACT.—EXONERATION OF MORTGAGED PROPERTY.

Mollish v. Vallins, V. C. W., 10 W. R. 421.

Mr. Locke King's Act, 17 & 18 Vict. c. 113, was intended no doubt to reverse completely the rule of law relating to the exoneration of mortgaged estates devised by will. The old rule was that the devisee was entitled to take the real estate exonerated from the incumbrance, which was to be borne out of the testator's personality. This was the general rule; but the testator might of course manifest some intention (although not explicitly) that the devisee should take *cum onere*. Such, however, was the leaning of the Court in favour of the land, that even where the devise was expressed to be "subject to the mortgage," these words were not considered sufficiently strong evidence of the testator's intention to burthen the devised estate, and relieve his personality, which the law considered to be primarily liable. The 17 & 18 Vict. c. 113, provides that unless the testator has signified any other intention, the devisee shall not be entitled to have the mortgage debt discharged out of the personal estate. The words of the Act are so clear as to afford little room for doubt that the intention of the Legislature was simply to reverse the old rule. This being so, it might be supposed that there would have been little difficulty in construing the enactment; nor would there be were it not for the leaning of the Court in favour of the land which we have already mentioned, which gave the old rule an application more extensive than its mere terms seemed to warrant. Formerly the devised estate was exonerated out of the personality, unless the will indicated another intention; now the devised estate bears its own burden, unless the will indicates another intention; and as formerly the Court required very strong and plain words of an intention which was against the leaning of the Court, it is not strange that since the new Act there should have been considerable hesitation about not only adopting its provisions, but relinquishing a settled tendency of the Court. The best account of the authorities before the Act is that they required not merely evidence of an intention to charge the real estate, but also to exonerate the personal estate. There have been already several reported cases which will afford the best illustration of what we have pointed out.

The first of the cases under the Act is *Greated v. Greated*, 26 Beav. 621. There a testator gave the real and residue of his real and personal estate, "after paying his mortgage and other debts," which Sir J. Romilly, M. R., considered was a sufficient direction for the exoneration of mortgaged property was devised by the testator. The next case is *Pembroke v. Friend*, 1 Joh. & H. 132, in which the testator directed that all his just debts should be paid as soon as might be after his decease, and then devised the house which he occupied to his wife in fee. Sir W. P. Wood, V. C., did not consider that the direction for the payment of debts was such an expression of contrary intention as to bring the case within the saving clause of

the statute, and held that the house being subject to a mortgage, the wife took it *cum onere*. His Honour was of opinion that the testator's direction for the payment of his debts must be understood as meaning that they were to be paid according to the Act. "The direction for payment of debts," he says, "does not in any way conflict with the Act, which merely enacts that in effecting such payment the assets shall be applied in a particular way. The testator does not say that the debts are to be paid out of his personal estate, or by his executors. Had he used the words 'by my executors,' there would have been something on which to build the conclusion that he meant to express an intention that the general statutory rule should not apply." It will be seen that there is nothing inconsistent in these two decisions, as in *Greated v. Greated* the testator points out a particular fund, namely, the residue, for the payment of his mortgage debts, while in *Pembroke v. Friend* no particular fund is mentioned, and there is only a direction that the testator's debts shall be paid. The passage which we have cited from the judgment of Sir W. P. Wood, V. C., was no doubt called forth by the case of *Wolstencroft v. Wolstencroft*, 8 W. R. 405, which a few days previously had been decided by Sir J. Stuart, V. C., but which we take thirdly in order of date, as it subsequently came before Lord Chancellor Campbell, upon appeal (9 W. R. 42). In that case the testator directed that all his debts should be paid by his executors out of his estate, which the Vice-Chancellor Stuart considered sufficiently manifested an intention to exonerate mortgaged property which had been devised; and there is no doubt great force in the observations upon this point contained in his Honour's judgment. "If," he says, "a testator intends that a devisee of a mortgaged estate should not pay the mortgage debt, the clearest way of manifesting such an intention is to direct that somebody else shall pay it; and if, as in this case, a testator clearly directs that his executors should pay all his debts, surely he clearly signifies an intention that the devisee of the mortgaged estate is not to pay the mortgage debt. It may be objected to this view, that there was no express mention of the mortgage debt; but the testator expressly directed that his debts should be paid by his executors, thus manifesting an intention that they should be paid in a course of administration different from that pointed out by the Act." His Honour was impressed by the fact that the testator had given the whole of the personal estate to his widow, who was also one of the executors. Lord Campbell, however, was of opinion that the direction for the payment of debts by the executors out of the testator's estate was not a clear indication of the testator's meaning that the devisee was to take the land free of the charge, and to throw it upon his personal estate. The next case in order of time is *Smith v. Smith*, 7 Jur. N. S. 1140. There the testator devised a house to E. S. in fee, and bequeathed the residue of his personal estate to three trustees (E. S. being one), all of whom he appointed executors, and declared that they should, out of the moneys to arise from the sale and conversion of his personal property, pay his debts, &c. The property devised to E. S. being subject to a mortgage, Sir J. Stuart, V. C., held that the devised property was exonerated out of the personal estate. In *Wolstencroft v. Wolstencroft* the direction was for payment of the testator's debts out of his estate, but here it was to be out of the personal estate, which the Vice-Chancellor considered was quite sufficient evidence of an intention to exonerate the mortgaged property. His Honour, in his judgment, takes occasion to advert to Lord Campbell's decision in *Wolstencroft v. Wolstencroft*, and discusses the difficulty which arises when we travel beyond the words of the statute itself. The Vice-Chancellor considers that the statute merely reverses the rule which exonerated the real estate at the expense of the personality, in the absence of all evidence of intention. Under the old doctrine, as under the new, where there was no evidence of intention there could be no question about the rule; but formerly, as we have seen, evidence of any "contrary or other intention" was not sufficient to displace the rule. There must have been, as Lord Eldon said in *Boyle v. Blundell*, 19 Ves. 517, "demonstration plain, plain intention, and a necessary implication," and not merely an intention to charge the devised estate, but to exonerate the personality. Lord Campbell, in *Wolstencroft v. Wolstencroft*, considers that not only is the rule of law altered by the statute, but the same plain and clear evidence of intention is necessary to bring a case within its saving clause as was formerly necessary to prevent the application of the old rule. "The mortgaged lands" said his Lordship, "being now made primarily liable, a liberty was still given to the testator to make an exception to the new rule, and still to throw the charge on

the personal estate. But this was to be done by his clearly signifying this intention. In my opinion he can only signify this intention by express words, or by the language employed, that he meant the devisee or heir to take the land free of the charge, and to throw the charge upon his personal estate.

We now proceed to consider another very important case, which has recently been decided at the Rolls—*Allen v. Allen*, 10 W. R. 261. There a testatrix devised upon trust two farms which were charged with a mortgage, and then gave the residue of her real estate (including by name another farm, which was subject to a mortgage not created by her), and also all the residue of her personal estate, and as to any mortgage debts which might be charged upon any part of her residuary real or personal estates, directed that they should be exclusively borne by the premises charged therewith; and subject thereto directed that all her debts, &c., should be paid out of her said residuary real and personal estate, which she charged with payment of the same. The question was, whether the residuary estate was to pay all the mortgage debts on the specifically devised estates as well as those on the residuary estate, and this Sir J. Romilly, M.R., answered in the affirmative. His Honour considered that when the testatrix directed all her debts to be paid out of the residue, the word "debts" included mortgage debts.

The only other reported case bearing upon the point under consideration, before we come to the above-named case of *Mollish v. Vallins*, is that of *Stone v. Parker*, 1 Dr. & Sm. 212. There a testator directed his trustees to stand possessed of his residuary estate "subject in the first place to the payment of my just debts, funeral, and testamentary expenses," and afterwards he empowered them to "satisfy any debts owing, or claimed to be owing by me, or from my estate;" and Sir R. T. Kindersley, V.C., was of opinion that the testator had sufficiently indicated his intention to exonerate a mortgaged estate, which he had specifically devised; and this seems to have been his Honour's opinion, independently of the authority of V. C. Stuart's decision in *Wolstencroft v. Wolstencroft*, which had not then been heard upon appeal. He appears, however, to have been influenced by the decision of the Vice-Chancellor in that case, his Honour treating it as an authority for saying that where there is a direction for payment of debts mortgage debts are included.

We now come to the recent case of *Mollish v. Vallins*, in which the point arose for the second time before Sir W. P. Wood, V.C. In this case the testator had devised his real estate in trust for his wife during her life, and bequeathed to her his personal estate for her absolute use, subject to the payment thereof of all his debts, &c.; and he appointed her executrix of his will. After a careful review of the authorities, the Vice-Chancellor held that the mortgage debt ought to be borne by the personal estate in exoneration of the devised mortgaged estate. "Under the old law," said his Honour, "there must have been, not only an intention to charge the real estate, but also an intention to discharge the personal estate. There was no rule to be found going beyond this, and anything further rested on mere vague expressions. If that rule was to be applied to the present state of the law, then, in the absence of express words to that effect, the mortgaged estate would not be exonerated. He was not satisfied that this rule must be so applied. Looking at the strong leanings of the Court towards the heir, and in favour of real estate, no one could feel surprised that such a rule had been adopted, or that there had been an inclination to extend it in favour of the heir as much as possible." This brings us back to the point from whence we originally started. The question is whether Mr. Locke King's Act not only reverses the rule but also the leaning of the Court. But for this leaning it is plain enough in the case before us that when the testator directed all his just debts to be paid, he meant to include his mortgage debts, and thus to exonerate the mortgaged property which he had specifically devised; and such was the opinion of the learned Vice-Chancellor.

We have thus given a summary of all the reported cases bearing upon this point. We believe that it again came under the consideration of the Master of the Rolls within a few weeks past, in a case of *Hepworth v. Hill* (not yet reported), in which, however, if rightly informed, his Honour adhered to his decision in *Allen v. Allen*. Upon the whole it cannot be said that the authorities relating to the question are in a very intelligible or reconcilable condition. Sir W. P. Wood, V.C., in his recent judgment, evidently disagrees with the dicta of Lord Campbell in *Wolstencroft v. Wolstencroft*, which we have quoted. Sir J. Romilly, M. R., without noticing these dicta, entirely approves

of the Lord Chancellor's decision in that case. Sir R. T. Kindersley, V. C., does not disapprove of, but rather adopts the decision of Sir J. Stuart, V. C., which Lord Campbell afterwards reversed; so that it is not easy to arrive at a clear notion of what is the present doctrine of courts of equity as to the point under consideration. The best attempt that we can make at stating it is as follows:—A mere direction that the testator's debts should be paid, even though his executors should be the parties directed to pay them, would not be sufficient to exonerate devised or descended real estate; therefore the decision of Vice-Chancellor Stuart, in *Wolstencroft v. Wolstencroft*, and of Vice-Chancellor Kindersley, in *Stone v. Parker*, and the *obiter dictum* of Vice-Chancellor Wood, in *Pembroke v. Friend*, are to be considered as overruled. But where the testator directs payment of his debts out of a particular fund—*ex. gr.*, his personal estate, as in *Smith v. Smith*, or residuary estate, as in *Allen v. Allen*, or where he gives the residue of his real estate after paying his mortgage debts, as in *Greaved v. Greaved*—there such direction will be deemed evidence of an intention to exonerate the mortgaged estate at the expense of the fund indicated. This distinction is sufficiently intelligible, and would seem to give the intended effect and operation to Mr. Locke King's Act. A testator may well express his desire or direct that all his debts should be paid without being deemed to have the intention of varying the order in which his estate would be administered according to law. But on the other hand, it seems reasonable that where a testator goes further, and directs that all his debts shall be paid out of a particular fund, he should be considered to mean what he says so expressly, the effect of which would be the exoneration of any incumbered property which he had devised by his will.

COMMON LAW.

"CRIME," LEGAL DEFINITION OF—LAW OF EVIDENCE—14 & 15 VICT. c. 99.

Parker v. Green, Q. B., 10 W. R. 316.

It may appear a somewhat singular statement that it is by no means easy to pronounce what conduct does and what does not amount to a crime by the law of England—or, to put the proposition in other words, to say whether in a given case a man who is proceeded against for contravening the law is proceeded against criminally or otherwise; and yet such is sometimes the case, as we shall proceed to explain. The term "crime," so constantly used, is often loosely applied. Its proper technical definition appears to be that it is the violation of a right, when considered in reference to the evil tendency of such violation as regards the community at large; but in ordinary language, only such offences are considered as "crimes," which, being also either misdemeanours or felonies, are subjects for indictment as distinguished from a penalty recoverable by way of summary conviction before magistrates. This discrepancy between the technical meaning of a crime (which would include the breach of any enactment not expressly made punishable by a penalty to be so recovered), and the popular reception of the term, is by no means of a theoretical kind merely; but has led to a practical difficulty of considerable importance, which on several occasions, in one shape or another, has engaged the courts. Thus, in the case of *Attorney-General v. Rudloff* (10 Exch. 84) a very long discussion took place as to whether a person proceeded against under the Smuggling Act (8 & 9 Vict. c. 87) for penalties, was admissible as a witness—that question depending again upon whether such proceedings were or were not criminal, for if they were of that character then the defendant was incompetent as a witness in his own case, by 14 & 15 Vict. c. 99, ss. 2, 3. The court of Exchequer were divided in this matter; and a highly interesting set of judgments was delivered in which the general question of the proper meaning of the term "crime" was discussed. Subsequently, in *Cattell v. Fresson* (E. B. & E. 91) the same question was raised in the Court of Queen's Bench in reference to proceedings for a penalty on breach of the game laws, which were held by the whole Court to be criminal, and consequently to incapacitate the offender from giving evidence; and again, in the case of *Legg v. Pardoe* (9 W. R. 234), the opinion of the chief justice of the Common Pleas was incidentally elicited to be, that the circumstance of an Act providing imprisonment with hard labour in default of the payment of a penalty imposed thereby, was not conclusive with regard to all offences under the same Act being criminal. In the present case, the Queen's Bench have held that a publican proceeded against under 9 Geo. 4 c. 61, for an offence against the conditions of

his licence is incompetent as a witness at the trial of the information—a decision grounded on the same reasoning as that on which they acted in *Cattell v. Ireson*, but in reference to a different statute.

GAME LAWS—PROPERTY IN DEAD GAME—SUTTON v. MOODY
 CONSIDERED.

Blades v. Higgs, C. P., 10 W. R. 318.

The principles of law in reference to the property in game, and generally in animals *ferre nature*, were treated at some length by Blackstone, being, as it was, a branch of the law highly interesting to his audience. He tells us, among other things, upon the authority of a case (*Keble v. Hickringill*), reported in the 11 Modern Reports, 75, that if a man starts any game within his own grounds, and follow it into another's and kills it there, the property remains in the man who hunted it down; but that if he starts it and kills it on the land of another, it is the property *ratione soli* of the person on whose ground it was killed; for which last branch of the doctrine he cites the case of *Sutton v. Moody* (Lord Raym 251). A third case he puts it that of the game being started by A. in the land of B. and killed in the land of C., in which event he tells us that the property vests in the hunter, though guilty of a trespass against both B. and C. The present case was the second of those instanced by Blackstone—viz., that of rabbits started and killed by trespassers on the land of A. Now according to the case of *Sutton v. Moody* (as confirmed by a recent decision of the Exchequer Chamber, *Lonsdale v. Rigg*, 5 W. R. 355) the rabbits, under these circumstances, belonged to A., although they were, after being killed, carried off out of A.'s land (before he made any claim to them), and sold to a third party. And, consequently, the Court of Common Pleas held that the right *ratione soli* prevailed over that of the hunter. It was, however, intimated by them that they doubted as to whether the law laid down in *Sutton v. Moody* by Lord Holt was good; and whether the doctrine of the civil law was not, rather, part also of the law of this country; according to which the right of the hunter, whether a poacher or not, would prevail against any right claimed only *ratione soli* (see Just. Inst., 1—12). Being, however, bound by the decision of the Exchequer Chamber, in which the law, as laid down by Blackstone on the authority of Lord Holt, was followed, the Court decided in the present case (as already observed) in favour of the claim of the owner of the land on which the rabbits had been killed; but they gave leave to appeal against their discharge of a rule for a new trial (in which shape the question came before them), in order that the point might, if thought desirable, be taken to the House of Lords. It is to be observed that in *Lonsdale v. Rigg* the Court of Exchequer were equally divided, and that it was there intimated that it was expedient the point should be carried further. This was done; and by the course adopted by the Court of Common Pleas in the present case, the law on this important subject will probably be at length conclusively established by the highest authority.

Correspondence.

PROCURATION FEES.

I have frequently heard it asserted that, on the taxation of solicitors' bills of costs in respect of mortgages on real estate, the Taxing Master has actually refused to allow the usual procuration fee of 5s. per cent. If this is correct, I shall be glad to know upon what ground or authority the fee is disallowed. Perhaps some of your readers will point to any case within their knowledge where, on taxation, the fee has been allowed or refused, and, in either case, the reason for it. L. L. D.

STAMPS ON SEARCHES FOR WILLS.

Pray allow me to call your attention to an inconvenience the public and the profession are put to at the Probate Court, Doctor's Commons, in having to retrace their steps from the search office for wills to find some law stationer to sell them a search stamp, and again to go through a similar operation on bespeaking a copy will, and again on going for the office copy. This loss of time and vexation might be avoided if a clerk at a convenient desk in the office itself were licensed to sell the necessary stamps, as is done at the Chancery office.

April, 1862.

H. E.

The Provinces.

LEICESTER.—A very curious case, having reference to the right of ringing church bells, came a short time since before the county public-office, Leicester, when Mr. D. Waite, farmer, of Thurnby, appeared to answer a charge preferred against him by the Rev. J. K. Redhead, vicar, of having, on the 27th ult., been guilty of violent and indecent behaviour in breaking open the belfry door of the parish church. The court was densely crowded, and great interest prevailed during the hearing of the case. By the evidence it appeared that from 1857 it had been the custom of the churchwardens of the village, on the occasion of Lord Stamford's hounds meeting there, to ring the church bells in honour of his lordship. When, however, the hounds met on the 17th ult., the vicar felt it his duty to interfere, and ordered the bells not to be rung, with the understanding that if his commands were disobeyed, he should take legal proceedings against the parties offending. Accordingly, on the evening of Sunday, the 16th (the day before the hounds met), he nailed down the latch of the belfry door, besides taking the precaution to prevent ingress by locking the door and tying the key in it. At 7 o'clock the following morning the defendant gave orders to the parish constable, who happened to be a wheelwright, to open the door, which was done by lifting it off its hinges with a crowbar. The ringers then ascended the belfry and for two hours or more rang the bells in honour of Lord Stamford's visit, much to the annoyance of the vicar, who was kept outside the church until the ringing had nearly subsided. The magistrates dismissed the case.

WELLS.—At the Somerset Quarter Sessions, which commenced at Wells, before Sir W. Miles, Bart., M.P., on the 8th inst., Mr. W. Moody stated that at the last session the Recorder of Bath had startled the Court by an announcement that the crier was in the habit of getting a shilling fee for swearing every witness called on behalf of a prisoner. In consequence of what then passed, he gave notice of a motion which he now proposed, that the taking of such fees was illegal, and ought to be discontinued. It was monstrous that in an English court of justice a prisoner should be obliged to pay such a fee in order to get a fair trial, and he considered that the Court would not do its duty if it did not adopt his motion. The crier had expressed his willingness to abide by the decision of the Court. Mr. Dickenson, in seconding the motion, observed that such fees were entirely contrary to the spirit of Magna Charta—that justice was not to be bought. Sir W. G. Hayter differed as to the illegality of taking the fees. In former times the prisoner could not examine his witnesses upon oath at all. When prisoners' witnesses were allowed to be sworn, then for the first time the shilling was taken. He was not terrified at so grievous an injustice, as it was termed, and was not satisfied as to its illegality, but was nevertheless willing that the practice should be abandoned. After some further discussion, Mr. Moody's motion was adopted, with the omission of the word "illegal."

Foreign Tribunals and Jurisprudence.

FRANCE.

The Imperial Court lately gave a judgment on an appeal from a decision of the Civil Tribunal, which decides several points of law of considerable interest to foreigners. The circumstances of the case were as follows:—In April, 1857, Miss Clementine Thompson, an English lady, aged twenty, was married in England to a Frenchman calling himself Prince de Rohan de Fénis, aged sixty-eight, since deceased. The witnesses of the marriage were Lord Clarendon, Lord and Lady Palmerston, and several other persons of high rank. From that marriage there was issue a son, born in December, 1857, in Paris, and registered in his father's name at the Mairie of the 10th arrondissement. In the following February the Prince de Rohan-Rochefort cited Madame de Rohan de Fénis before the Civil Tribunal of the Seine, to show cause why she should not be forbidden to bear the name of Rohan. Madame de Rohan de Fénis pleaded that the Prince, being an Austrian subject, could not appeal to the French tribunals on the matter, but the objection was overruled, the cause was tried, and the tribunal gave a judgment prohibiting Madame de Rohan de Fénis and her son from bearing the name of Rohan, and ordering that the registration of the child should be rectified. From that judgment the lady appealed.

The appeal cause being heard before M. Devienne and other judges, M. Berryer, for the widow, argued, as a preliminary objection, that being an Englishwoman, the court had no jurisdiction over her. This demurrer was, however, overruled by the Court, on the ground that although the Code lays it down that a Frenchwoman marrying a foreigner only loses her nationality during the marriage, the converse proposition does not hold, and that a foreign woman marrying a Frenchman, in the view of the French tribunals, a Frenchwoman even when a widow. This interesting point of international jurisprudence is, we believe, decided for the first time. Upon the merits of the case M. Berryer was not furnished with any positive evidence even to show that his client's husband was a Rohan, much less that he was a prince. He stated, in a general way, that for two generations the chateau of Tourondel had been inhabited by the ancestors of his client's husband, Counts de Fénis and Marquises of Tourangel, who, he alleged, were a younger branch of the house of Rohan, and had fallen into poverty. But his great card, and one which, if it had not been discredited by the judgment of the Court, would certainly weigh greatly in the controversy, was a letter, which he read, addressed by Charles X.'s minister of state to the individual who is now judicially branded as an intruder and an imposter.

On November 11th, 1828, Baron de la Bouillierie wrote to the deceased husband of the defendant the following letter:—"The Baron de la Bouillierie, peer of France, minister of state, intendant-general of the king's household, has the honour to offer the assurance of his most distinguished consideration to the Count de Tourondel-Ventadour, and to inform him that, conformably to his desire, he has had the honour of laying before the king his title of marquis, which his majesty had condescended to examine attentively, and which appears to him to be most honourable. In consequence, and in obedience to the king's orders, the Baron de La Bouillierie returns the papers, at the same time assuring the count, on the part of his majesty, that his titles have no need to be renewed, seeing that they are hereditary and perpetual, and that he could not have better. His majesty orders him further to assure the Count de Tourondel-Ventadour that the title of marquis most incontestably belongs to him, and that he has a right to the title of Duke de Rohan and de Ventadour, as being the head of the younger branch of that house, and he may therefore use that title without authorisation. The Baron de la Bouillierie congratulates himself upon having been able to do anything agreeable to the Count de Tourondel-Ventadour."

M. Lepeque, counsel for Prince Camille de Rohan, described the deceased husband of the defendant in terms that no one would suppose applicable to the flattered correspondent of Charles X.'s minister of state, and the man who was recognised by that monarch as Count de Tourondel-Ventadour, Marquis of something else, and Duke de Rohan. M. Lepeque said:—"M. Fénis de Tourondel, when he went to England, had no other name, and he then for the first time got the name of Rohan inserted in his passport. At that time M. Fénis was 'wanted' by the public prosecutor, who accused him of a serious misdemeanour—namely, that of being a member, if not the head, of a society formed for the purpose of fabricating false and imaginary foreign orders. The result of the trial was that M. Fénis, *alias* Rohan's, accomplices were found guilty, and he himself only escaped for the very sufficient reason that he died first. In January, 1858, Prince Camille de Rohan received from his cousin, Prince de Rohan Chabot, a letter in which the facts of the usurpation of the name of Rohan by M. Fénis were set forth in the several instances of his passport, his marriage certificate in England, and the 'act of birth' of his son inscribed in the civil register in Paris. M. de Rohan Chabot, in stigmatising these facts, added, 'If M. Fénis had presumed to take the name of Rohan Chabot I should have sent him a writ directly; it is not to be endured that any impostor should be allowed to assume a name of which there are many existing heirs.' The fact is that M. Fénis fled to Jersey to escape the researches of the police. There he assumed the name of Rohan and lived upon charity, which he received from the Catholic chapels of the island. Unfortunately for himself he conceived the idea of setting up in his old business of selling titles of nobility. An action was brought against him on this account, and he got in such bad odour in the Isle of Jersey that he was fain to leave it and go to London. He was then sixty-eight years old, and in a frightful state of misery and disease. Nevertheless, Miss Thompson, although only twenty years old, was dazzled by the name of Rohan, and, notwithstanding all the true information which she received, consented to marry him. The

marriage lasted six days, from April the 27th to May 4th, 1857. On the latter day the husband died of a malady which is described in the registrar's certificate as "prolonged consumption." Miss Thompson, therefore, married at the point of death. Nevertheless she became *enclave*, and was confined in Paris of a son exactly eight months after the marriage, the premature confinement being attributed to an accident."

Here the advocate was stopped by the first president, Devienne, the Court being with him.

The Appeal Court, confirming the judgment of the Court below, held that Madame de Fénis (*née* Thompson) had no right either to the title of princess or the name of Rohan, and restrained her from using them. This is a terrible lesson to ladies who aspire to marry distinguished foreigners.

It is interesting to notice how the same questions connected with the administration of justice and the constitution of the judicature arise in different countries. In England there has long been a growing tendency to exclude judges from all direct participation in politics or legislation. The last important discussions amongst us upon this subject were those relating to the exclusion of the Master of the Rolls, and also of county court judges, from the House of Commons. The latest and one of the greatest efforts of Mr., afterwards Lord, Macaulay, was in the debate some years ago upon the former question. A movement is now going on in Paris involving precisely the same considerations.

A short time since two petitions were presented in the Senate by the Marquis de Larochejaquelein, praying that all persons exercising judicial functions should be prohibited by law from presenting themselves as candidates for the Legislative Chamber in the district within their jurisdiction. M. Baroche defended the existing system. He said, that if a magistrate offered himself to the electors with the assent of the Government, he would be entitled to describe himself as a candidate accepted by the "Administration," but if he came forward against the wishes of the Government he had not the right to appear as the official candidate; and this was all the Government could do. It was alleged by M. de Larochejaquelein that if a judge presented himself without the consent, or against the wishes, of the Government, he would most probably be dismissed from his post. "No," said M. Baroche, "for he could not be dismissed if he belonged to the *irremovable* magistracy." You are aware that according to the judicial system prevailing in France the inferior class of judges known as *Juges de Paix*, and who have jurisdiction in petty cases, final as far as 50*fr.*, and subject to appeal as far as 100*fr.*, as well as summary jurisdiction in other minor matters, are removable. M. Larochejaquelein cited a case of recent occurrence, where a *Juge de Paix*, who had opposed and beaten the Procureur Impérial at a contested election, was dismissed almost immediately; and the inference naturally was that the dismissal was meant as a punishment for opposing an official candidate. The point at issue is whether the judge is completely protected from official vengeance, as M. Baroche alleges. True, a judge cannot be dismissed at the mere pleasure of the Government. He holds his place for life. He is *irremovable*. But, yet his *promotion* depends on the goodwill of the Government. The gradation of the judicial body is organised pretty much like that of the army. In civil suits the magistracy bear a high reputation for probity; but it is much to expect that a judge of Police Correctionnelle, for instance, with a yearly salary of £100, will never be subservient to the Government in whose hands his career is, but will always sacrifice his hope of advancement to stern duty. There has been hardly a political prosecution for some years past in which the Government and the public were not sure of a conviction. One case which made a good deal of noise a year or two ago, and in which the Government was greatly interested, resulted in the prosecution of the public prosecutor and of the presiding judge, who sentenced the accused to fine and imprisonment for a *délit* of the press. The accused was a person obnoxious from his position, his talents, and his opinions, and it was most desirable to make an example of him.

A bill has recently been laid before the Corps Législatif, which creates a new offence, by making it penal to have in one's possession an aquib or caricature against any person in authority—from the Emperor to a judge of the Corrections Police! It is proposed to add to the article of the penal code punishing disrespect against judges whilst in court, the words:—

"If the offence has been committed by a writing, or a draw

ing, not published, the penalty shall be imprisonment from a fortnight, at least, to one year, at most."

This proposed innovation has excited great reprobation in legal circles, and among the public generally. One of the Paris legal papers, the *Droit*, remarks:—

"This is a very great and very serious innovation, as it transforms into an offence what hitherto has never been thought to call for repression. No one had hitherto imagined that the man who sketches for his own amusement any design whatsoever, who keeps the sketch in his house, was liable to prosecutions, seizures, perquisitions, domiciliary visits, and imprisonment. The old penal code of 1810 did not make it penal, nor did the ordinance of 1670, and yet it is not a very recent habit for persons to write a squib, or draw a caricature of persons in authority."

It is not, however, likely that, in its present mood, the Corps Législatif will pass this monstrous and inquisitorial measure.

Review.

The Statutes, General Orders, and Regulations relating to the Practice, Pleading, and Jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery. By GEORGE OSBORNE MORGAN, M.A., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. 3rd Edition. Stevens, Sons, & Haynes, 1862.

We have so recently* presented our readers with a lengthened review of the 2nd edition of the work now before us that we think it unnecessary to do much more than point out its special features in its new shape. Before doing so, however, we may mention that the system of treating the statutory practice of the Court of Chancery as distinct from its general practice appears to meet with so much favour, and is so very convenient for purposes of such business as is governed by the statutes solely, that its concomitant inconveniences have been almost entirely overlooked. In this new edition Mr. Morgan has attempted, to some extent, to touch upon general practice, wherever it appeared necessary to do so, for the purpose of elucidating the particular statutory enactments and General Orders with which he was dealing; and it only requires that he should still further carry out this plan to make his book of the utmost utility to practitioners in both branches of the profession. Editions of statutes, where the subject matter is *sui generis*, or, at all events, distinct and capable of separate treatment without obscurity or confusion, are no doubt extremely useful; they are temporarily convenient for the purposes of gathering up and collating the cases at the earliest moment—before they were likely to be incorporated in a larger work. But it is not desirable that all these several works should continue separate for ever. Every lawyer knows the difficulty of bearing in mind the provisions of such statutes as have owed their parentage to Lord St. Leonards of late years. They contain a number of heterogeneous enactments which would take a long time to find their proper classification in the text books. Until then, however, separate editions of all these several Acts are not merely the best, but, in fact, are the only, means of dealing with them. When the Chancery Amendment Acts and Orders of 1852, and also the Trustee and Trustee Relief Acts, first made their appearance, it was natural enough that they should all be edited separately—so far, at least, as the general practice of the court was concerned. In many respects they so completely revolutionised it, that some time was required, as well as some experience of their working, before anything like a "harmony" of the old and new procedure could be effected. The last edition of Mr. Sidney Smith's well-known work is the best effort of the kind that has yet been made; although, perhaps, an older edition of Daniell would have afforded a more satisfactory basis for such an undertaking. Before the appearance of the recent edition of Mr. Morgan's book, we thought it not unlikely that he might extend its scope so as to include the entire of Chancery procedure; but he seems to prefer adhering to his original plan, which has certainly the prestige of success. It cannot be doubted, however, that there is some inconvenience in perpetuating the distinction between those portions of the practice, pleading, and jurisdiction of the court which are attributable to Acts of Parliament and its own General Orders on the one hand, and on the other, such portions as cannot be referred to these sources. At the same time, it must be admitted that it is very handy to have all the cases relating to these enact-

ments, and orders grouped under them, clause by clause, so that at a glance we may inform ourselves fully of every decision relating to any particular clause. The probability is, that this plan affords such ready assistance to persons involved in the hurry of actual practice, that it will become soon acknowledged as a necessity, and therefore we are not unlikely to have the distinction between practice that is statutory and practice that is not so rendered by the text-writers more marked and more permanent than in the abstract it is desirable it should be.

As to the particular merits of Mr. Morgan's book, we have already on former occasions expressed ourselves so fully, that it is needless for us now to add anything further. We need only say that the new edition exhibits the same industry in the collection of cases, and the same accuracy in shortly expressing the points decided, as characterised the two former editions; and in reference to the distinction to which we have alluded, although Mr. Morgan retains the title and general scheme of his original work, he has made numerous additions connecting it with the earlier practice of the court, which greatly increase its value as a general guide to Chancery procedure.

The Law of Trade Marks, with some Account of its History and Development in the Decisions of the Courts of Law and Equity. By EDWARD LLOYD, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. W. Draper, Carey-street. 1862.

Inasmuch as the greater portion of the work now before us appeared in these columns towards the close of the last volume and in the earlier numbers of the present one, we shall not be guilty of the unseemliness of presenting our readers with anything like a review of it. We shall only say that Mr. Lloyd having collected together his contributions to this journal on the Law of Trade Marks, they constitute, in the whole, the materials for a very useful and exhaustive treatise upon the subject. Such a work was certainly a desideratum, and, judging from what Mr. Lloyd has done, we think our readers will agree with us that it could hardly have fallen into better hands.

Societies and Institutions.

LAW AMENDMENT SOCIETY.

The tenth general meeting of the Society for Promoting the Amendment of the Law was held on Monday last. The Attorney-General occupied the chair.

Before the ordinary business of the evening commenced, Mr. HASTINGS gave notice that at the next meeting he should bring forward a resolution relative to the recent decision of the House of Commons in rejecting the Government bill for erecting new courts of law in the vicinity of Temple-bar, and stated he should invite the society to remonstrate against this decision. In giving this motion, he took occasion to express his disapproval of the scheme suggested by some members of parliament during the debate in the House of Commons that the courts should be built in Lincoln's-inn.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, at the close of the proceedings, stated he did not think he should be able to be present at the discussion of the motion, notice of which had been given at the commencement of their proceedings. He regretted the decision which the House of Commons arrived at, and it was, he believed, mainly attributable to the fact that there was a thin House; that Lincoln's-inn, wise in its generation, had concentrated its forces to reject the bill; and that the exigencies of the public service at this time demanded a large outlay. He, however, hoped that an early opportunity would occur of again bringing the matter forward, and having it discussed in a fuller house.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

On Wednesday last, the eighth half-yearly general meeting of this society, was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, JAMES ANDERTON, Esq., in the chair. The secretary (Mr. EIFFE,) read the following report for the half-year:—

"The receipts, exclusive of the balance of £165 16s. 10d. last reported, have been £603 17s. 6d. The payments have amounted to £147 8s. 6d. A sum of £35 out of the half-year's dividend has been awarded for the relief of applicants, and £450 have been invested in Consols, leaving a balance of £137 5s. 10d. to the society's credit. The selection of a more remunerative investment than Consols, for the capital of

the society, has in consequence of the requests of successive general meetings, been again a subject of consideration by the board, who have adopted the India Five per cent. Stock for a portion of the society's investments. The funded capital of the society now stands as follows:—£3,388 9s. 2d. Three per cent. Consols. and £2,000 India Five per cent. Stock. The income applicable to the purposes of relief is increased from £170 to £200. The aggregate number of members now enrolled in the association is 1,106, of whom 52 have been added during the half-year. Of the gross number of members enrolled, 416 are life members and 690 are annual—11 members contributing to the society under both denominations. The board, looking at the large number of the profession who have not yet accorded any support to the charity, hope that future half-years will exhibit a more favourable result. The board have much pleasure in announcing, that Lord Chelmsford has, with the utmost courtesy, responded to their invitation to preside at the public dinner, which will be held at the Albion tavern, Aldersgate-street, London, on Wednesday, the 28th of May next, for promoting the objects of the society; and they confidently hope that the members of the society, and their professional brethren at large, will use their best efforts to render the intended celebration worthy of the distinguished auspices under which it is to be held, and productive of material benefit to the association. Eighty-seven members have already consented to act as stewards.

The Report having been adopted, Mr. J. MACKRELL (of London) gave the following notice of motion for the next April general meeting:—"That Rule 13 be so varied as to provide that all annuitants or pensioners shall be elected by the members and not by the directors, out of candidates approved of by the directors." The usual resolutions having been passed, the meeting then terminated.

Law Students' Journal.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS BEFORE ENTERING INTO ARTICLES OF CLERKSHIP TO ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS.

The special examiners appointed by the judges, by an order dated the 26th November, 1861, have selected the following parts of books, in which the examinations will take place at the examination on the 12th and 13th May, 1862:—

In Latin: Cæsar's Commentaries de Bello Gallico; or Virgil's *Æneid* (Books 7 to 10).

In Greek: Xenophon's *Anabasis*; or, Homer's *Iliad* (Books 4 to 6).

In modern Greek: Βακχάρου, περί Ἀδίκημάτων καὶ Ποινῶν μεταφρασμένων ἀπὸ τῆν Ἰταλιανὴν Γλῶσσαν; or, Βερνέτι's *Istoria τῆς Ἀμαρτίας*.

In French: Montesquieu, *De l'Esprit des Lois* (books 17 and 18); or, Corneille's *Cid* (Acts 1 and 2).

In German: Goethe's *Wahrheit und Dichtung* (9th Book); or, Schiller's *Marie Stuart* (Act 4).

In Spanish: Cervantes's *Don Quixote*; or, Dom Hartzembuch's *La Coja y el Encogido*.

In Italian: Manzoni's *Promessi Sposi*; or, Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*.

Each candidate will be examined in *one only* of the Languages and *one only* of the two works above mentioned.

All notices and inquiries should be addressed to the Secretary of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, W.C.

R. MAUGHAM, Secretary.

Law Society's Hall, 14th April, 1862.

Public Companies.

MEETINGS.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

The annual general meeting of this society was held at the house of the society, 10, Fleet-street, on Monday last, to receive the auditors' report for the year, &c. Mr. Bigge presided.

The cash account showed, among other matters, that during the year there had been received for new premiums on 155 policies, assuring £140,902, the sum of £7,893 3s. 4d. The renewal premiums had produced £109,230 6s. 7d.

The account was unanimously adopted.

The meeting was afterwards made an extraordinary one.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the meeting was convened in pursuance of the deed of settlement for the purpose of declaring the amount of profit to be set apart out of the assurance fund in respect of the five years ending the 31st of December, 1861. He then went on to read from the report, to the effect that on the 31st of December, 1861, the excess of assets over liabilities had been £181,338, and, after deducting a reserve of £18,238, the net amount left for division remained at £163,100. The division would be made according to the proportions fixed by the deed of settlement, which would allow one-fifth in respect of the proprietors and four-fifths in respect of the assured. The share thus accruing to the proprietors' fund would amount to £32,620, and to the fund of the assured the share would be £130,480. The division for the proprietors showed an increase of 20 per cent. on the one which had preceded it.

The report having been read,

Mr. KENDAL said he had to move the following resolution: "That it is the interest of this society that the share of profits belonging to the proprietors on the present and every subsequent occasion should be paid to them in cash, and that the directors should at once take such steps as may be necessary to effect this object."

The resolution was duly seconded, and a lengthy discussion ensued.

On the resolution being put from the chair, it was carried by a large majority, the number voting against it being fifteen.

The report, with the exception of that part which related to the disposal of the profits of the proprietors, which excepted part was adjourned for further consideration, was adopted.

Admission of Attorneys.

NOTICES OF ADMISSION,

In and on the last day of Easter Term, 1862.

[The clerks' names appear in small capitals and the attorneys to whom articulated or assigned follow in ordinary type.]

BARNARD, JOSEPH GEORGE.—G. E. Williams, Cheltenham.

BENNETT, NORMAN.—W. Bennett, Chapel-en-le-Frith.

BOND, JOHN.—M. Myers, Preston.

BRADFORD, JOB.—R. Gardner, Leamington; R. S. Gregson, Angel-court, Throgmorton-street; J. B. Allen, Bedford-row.

BURNABY, JOHN FREDERICK.—G. Tallents, Newark-upon-Trent.

BURNAND, JOHN THOMAS NEWMAN.—E. E. D. Grove, 13, Copthall-court; J. G. Hick, 13, Copthall-court.

CHALK, EDMUND.—G. H. Seymour, York.

CHAMBERS, WILLIAM JOHN.—J. Franklin, Halifax; T. B. Chambers, Brighouse.

COOTE, FREDERIC ROBERT.—F. W. Thorpe, St. Ives.

DANIEL, OWEN FISHER.—M. L. Daniel, Ramsgate.

DEANE, HENRY.—Harry Footner, Andover.

DUMBLETON, HORATIO, B.A.—J. T. Bolton, Solihull, Warwick.

FLINTOFF, FLORENCE POWELL.—F. T. Bircham, 46, Parliament-street, Westminster.

GUY, HARRY CHARLES.—J. Guy, Hampton-wick; 8 Cannon-row, Westminster; H. Guy, Hythe.

JENKINSON, ARTHUR COOPER.—C. T. Jenkinson, Clement's-lane.

KNOWLES, JAMES HARDCASTLE.—J. Knowles, Bolton.

KNOWLES, ROBERT ANDREW.—J. Knowles, Bolton.

LOWE, JOHN.—H. Clegg, Oldham.

LUMB, ALFRED.—L. Harrison, Penrith.

MARTIN, GEORGE.—J. Bush, Bradford, Wilts.

MINSTER, ARTHUR.—R. H. Minster, Coventry.

PEARLESS, JAMES RICHARDSON.—William Fearless, East Grinstead.

PEARMAN, JOHN.—G. W. Maraden, 37, Queen-street, Cheap-side.

SALMON, ALAN BACKHOUSE.—R. F. Yarker, Ulverston.

SEALE, CHARLES GEORGE.—E. W. Seale, jun., Bank-chambers, Leicester-square.

SMITH, ROBERT WHITAKER.—W. Keary, Stoke-upon-Trent.

ULLITHORNE, OSCAR AUGUSTUS.—G. Capes, 1, Field-court, Gray's-inn.

WEBSTER, HENRY.—Thomas Price, 24, Abchurch-lane, City.

WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY.—Henry White, Williton, Somerset.

APPLICATION FOR RE-ADMISSION.

Last day of Easter Term, 1862.

Chandler, Benjamin, Sherborne.

APPLICATIONS TO TAKE OUT OR RENEW ATTORNEYS' CERTIFICATES.

May 14, 1862.

Baker, Alfred, Penistone; Lyndon, Rutland; and Bradford.
 Barber, John, Kingston-upon-Hull; 11, King's Bench-walk, Temple; and Upper Norwood.
 Bousfield, Walter Stanton, Ventnor, Isle of Wight; and The Grove, East Dulwich.
 Browne, Martin, Liverpool.
 Clarke, William, 115, Albany-road, Camberwell; and Ipswich Coates, John, Belize, British Honduras; Ottawa, Canada; and Bristol.
 Cullingford, Frederick James, 14, Pembroke-villas, Bayswater.
 Diekin, Roger Spencer, Birmingham.
 Gilbert, William, Little Bowden, Leicester.
 Kightley, William, 12, Carlton-street, Kentish-town.
 Law, William Edward, Barnstable; and 45, Great Cornam-street.
 Norton, George, West Dulwich, Surrey; and 7, Albion-grove, Stoke Newington.
 Padley, Frederick John, 52, Lincoln's-inn-fields; 158, Cambridge-street, Fimlico; 3, Great Ormond-street, Queen's-square; and Parthenon-chambers, Regent-street.
 Parkinson, Frederick Kidman, 1 Maldon-place, Kentish-town; South Norwood; and 5, Craddock-street, Haverstock-hill.
 Poole, Charles Paris, 24, Tysoe-street, Clerkenwell.
 Pritchard, Charles Edward, Lugg-vale, Hereford.
 Res, Christopher, Worcester.
 Robinson, John Jackson, York.
 Rossall, William Shaw, 36, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Smale, Clement, B.A., 4, Ormonde-terrace, Regent's-park; and St. Austell, Cornwall.
 Talbot, William Henry, Lower Broughton, near Manchester; and 6, Sloane-terrace, Chelsea.
 Truwhitt, Charles, 53, Lincoln's-inn-fields; and 57, Gloucester-place, Portman-square.
 Wakeman, Herbert John, 9, Berkeley-place, Cheltenham; and Bungay, Suffolk.
 Whatley, George, 13, Gower-place, Euston-square; 29, Gloucester-street, Queen-square; and 2 Regent-place West, Regent-square.
 Wrenthmore, George, Ashton-under-Lyme.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

It appears that in answer to the invitation inserted in this journal on 1st March last, 28 candidates applied and sent in their testimonials. After the lapse of the time limited, the council took into their careful consideration the testimonials received, and appointed a meeting of several of the candidates, from whom they selected Mr. Edward Walter Williamson, of Great James-street, Bedford-row, as their assistant secretary.

Court Papers.

Exchequer Chamber,
SITTINGS IN ERROR.

The following days have been appointed for the argument of errors and appeals:—

QUEEN'S BENCH.

Wednesday..... May 14 | Thursday May 15

COMMON PLEAS.

Friday..... May 16.

EXCHEQUER.

Saturday May 17 | Tuesday May 20
 Monday May 19

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

BASSETT—On April 14, at Sutherland-square, Walworth, the wife of Charles Bassett, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.
 HOWARD—On April 12, at Well-street, Hackney, the wife of W. T. Howard, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.
 SMITH—On March 29, at No. 5, Melcombe-place, Dorset-square, the wife of W. Compton Smith, Esq., of a son.

TRAILL—On April 14, at Blackheath, the wife of James Christie Tr Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.
 WARNER—On April 9, at Tanbridge, Kent, the wife of G. D. Warner, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.
 WEATHERALL—On March 30, at Dieppe House, Boundary-road, St. John's-wood, the wife of Edward Weatherall, jun., Esq., of a son.

MARRIAGES.

GRIFFITH—DEWHURST—On March 18, at Fredericksted, St. Croix Francis Bell Griffith, Esq., of the Colonial Bank, son of the late William Griffith, Esq., Barrister, of Windsor, Barbadoes, to Elizabeth Heyliger, daughter of the late Isaac H. Dewhurst, Esq., of St. Croix.
 OLDMAN—SHIELD—On April 10, T. H. Oldman, Esq., of Galasborough, Attorney-at-Law, to Helen, daughter of the late Henry Shield, Esq., of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

DEATHS.

CORY—On April 9, Emily, daughter of Henry Cory, of Lincoln's-inn.
 GLOVER—On March 17, aged 45, Edward Auchmuty Glover, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, J.P., Ex-M.P. for Beverley.
 PEARSE—On March 28, P. J. T. Pearse, Esq., of Frederick's-place, Old Jewry, aged 38.
 PHILCOX—On March 28, in the 80th year of his age, James Philcox, Esq., Solicitor.

London Gazettes.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1862.

Medland, William, and Frank Chapman Scargill, Attorneys and Solicitors, Dunstable, Luton, Market-st, and Taddington, Bedfordshire. By mutual consent. March 15.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, April 11, 1862.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Herald Life Assurance Society.—Creditors to meet before the Master of the Rolls, on April 16, at 1, to appoint a creditor's representative.
 South Lady Bertha Copper Mining Company.—Petition for winding-up, presented April 5, will be heard before Vice-Chancellor Wood, on April 26. W. J. Barrett, Solicitor for Petitioners, 8 Bell-yard, Doctor's-commons.

LIMITED IN BANKRUPTCY.

The London and Provincial Discount Company (Limited).—Petition for winding-up, presented April 7, will be heard before Commissioner Fane, on May 3, at 1. T. W. Wheat, Solicitor for Petitioner, 61 Berner's-st, Oxford-st.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1862.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Phoenix Life Assurance Company.—Vice-Chancellor Wood will proceed, on April 29 at 2 and 3, to settle the list (Class E) of contributors of this company.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, April 11, 1862.

Ainley, William, Bingley, Yorkshire, Surgeon. May 30. Sols Butterfield & Spencer, Bradford.
 Ainsworth, John, formerly of Lobcombe-cottage, near Salisbury, and late of Pitton, Wilts, Genl. May 23. Sols Hildings & Co, Salisbury.
 Bisey, Esther, late of Kilburn, Middlesex, and formerly of 194 Piccadilly, May 26. Sol Marcy, Wellington, Salop.
 Blakesley, Elizabeth, formerly of Castle Bromwich, Warwickshire, but late of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire, Widow. May 27. W. Ledam, 2 Bennett's-hill, Birmingham, Administrator.
 Borrer, William, Henfield, Sussex, Esq. May 21. Sols Blake & Freeman, Brighton.
 Chambre, Mary Alan, Bank Ground, Monk Coniston, Hawkshead, Lancashire, Spinster. June 1. Sols Bell, Brodrick, & Bell, 9 Bow Church-yard, London.
 Farquharson, Charles, 26 St. George's-rd, Fimlico, Middlesex, Esq. July 10. Sols Farrer, Ouvry, & Farrer, 66 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Goodinge, Elizabeth, 28 Clarence-pl, Milton, next Gravesend, Spinster. June 7. Sol Arnold, Gravesend.
 Haines, Richard, 51 New Bond-st, Middlesex, Poulterer. May 31. W. Dayly, 15 Marshall-st, Golden-sq, Middlesex, Executor.
 Halliburton, Teasdale Hilton, Brampton, Cumberland, Gent. May 5. Sol Forster, Brampton.
 Hammond, Anna Maria, Upper Moira-pl, Southampton, Widow. June 1. Sols Freshfields & Newman, 5 Bank-bridge, London.
 Harrison, Frederick, 23 Westbourne-park, Middlesex, and Bow Church-yd, London, Woolen Warehouseman. June 1. Sols Bell, Brodrick, & Bell, 9 Bow Church-yd, London.
 Heathcote, Rev. Thomas Henry, Leek, Staffordshire, Clerk and Vicar of Leek. June 1. Sol Jevons, Liverpool.
 Kennedy, Jane, formerly of Carlisle, Grand Duchy of Baden, and late of Clarendon-sq, Leamington, Spinster. July 11. Sols Farrer, Ouvry, & Farrer, 66 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Paget, Joshua, Thwaites, Kitchley, Yorkshire, Farmer. June 30. Sols Butterfield & Spencer, Bradford.
 Pickering, William, Moulton Park, Northamptonshire, Farmer. April 25. Sol Smith, Merthyr Tydfil.
 Smith, Dame Amelia, Grosvenor House, Knightsbridge, and formerly of 9 Lower Grove, Brompton, Kensington, Middlesex. May 16. Sol Wynne, 46 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Smith, Mr. Samuel, 67 Hunter-st, Dover-rd, and 136 Waterloo-rd, and No. 7, Great Charlotte-st, Blackfriars-rd, Surrey, Schoolmaster. June 1. Sol Meymott, 5 Albion-pl, Blackfriars-bridge.
 Webster, Baron Dickinson, Penns, Sutton Coldfield, Warwickshire, Esq. May 7. Sols Alcock & Milward, Birmingham.

THURSDAY, April 15, 1862.

Atkinson, John, Bassentwhite Hall, Bassentwhite, Cumberland, Yeoman. May 8. Sols Steel, Waugh, & Hartley, Cockermouth.
 Budd, Richard, formerly 22 Newport Market, previously of 8 Maddox-st, Regent-st, and late of 9 Riding House-st, Portland-rd, Middlesex, Tailor. May 15. Sol Terry, 14 King-st, Cheapside, London.
 Collard, Edward, Eddington, Herne, Kent, Gent. June 10. Sols Wightwick, Kingsford, & Fraser, Canterbury.
 Farmer, Samuel, Twickenham-park, Surrey, and of Langham-pl, Middlesex, Esq. May 14. Sols Hawkins, Bloxam, & Hawkins, Boswell-st, Lincoln's-inn, for Mott & Gayton, Much Hadham, Ware.
 Hanbury, Charles, formerly of Markham-sq, Chelsea, Middlesex, and late of 2 Frederick-pl, Upper Kennington-lane, Surrey, Gent. May 15. Sol Swanbridge, 126 Wood-st, Cheapside.
 Hume, Robert, Marshfield, Gloucestershire, Esq. June 7. Sol Potgrave, Bath.
 Lester, William, Tibenham, Norfolk, Farmer. May 31. Sols Hotson & Furness, Long Stratton, Norfolk.
 Lister, Maria, Twickenham, Middlesex. Spinster. June 24. Sols Harrison, Beal, & Harrison, 19 Bedford-rd, London.
 Lloyd, Samuel, the Farm, Bordesley, Aston, near Birmingham, Banker. May 15. Sols Griffiths & Bloxham, Birmingham.
 Neame, Catherine, formerly of Laton House, Selling, Kent, and late of Hythe, Spinster. June 10. Sols Wightwick, Kingsford, & Fraser, Canterbury.
 Palmer, Sarah, formerly of Upper George-st, Greenwich, Kent, but late of 2 Chapel-st, Park-rd, Chelsea, Middlesex, Widow. May 26. Sols Lott & Rogers, 43 Bow-lane, Cheapside.
 Read, John, Moorbottom, Dove, Derbyshire, Esq. June 1. Sols Gould & Son, Sheffield.
 Robinson, Philip, formerly of Bowling-green-lane, St. Marylebone, afterwards of Park-st, Camden-town, and late of Feltham, Middlesex, Grocer. May 16. Sols Jno. & J. K. Wright, 25 Bedford-rd, London.
 Roche, John, Falcon Public-house, Wandsworth-rd, Wandsworth, Surrey, Publican. June 10. Sols Tucker & New, 25 Clement's-lane, London.
 Slater, John, Old Malton, Yorkshire, Nursery and Seedsman. June 12. Sols A. & W. Simpson, New Malton.
 Sloper, Sarah, Wray Park, Reigate, Surrey, Widow. June 14. Sols West & King, 3 Charlotte-row, Mansion House.
 Smith, Sarah, Leach House, Hathersage, Derbyshire, Widow. May 20. Sols Bramley & Gainsford, 6 Paradise-square, Sheffield.
 Spokes, Thomas, Little Milton, Oxfordshire, Publican. May 12. Sols T. & G. Mallam, Oxford.
 Woodvatt, Thomas Mayors, Stone-house, Konver, Staffordshire, Screw Manufacturer. July 10. Sols Saunders & Son, Kidderminster.
 Zenogle, Elias, Montague-pl, Hammersmith, Middlesex, Spinster. May 30. Sol Kinsey, 9 Bloomsbury-pl, London.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, April 11, 1862.

Hooper, Thomas, 24 Thayer-st, Manchester-sq, Middlesex, Printer. April 23. Bennett, Hooper, M.R.
 Robinson, Sarah, Goldsmith-pl, Hackney-rd, Middlesex, Widow. May 5. Mayhew & Fumey, V. C. Kinderley.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1862.

Ross, Robert, Henrietta-st, Cavendish-sq, Middlesex, and of the Island of Jamaica, Esq. July 1. Duncan & Ross, M.R.
 Salmon, Benjamin, Albany-st, Regent's-pk, Middlesex, Grocer. May 12. Salmon & Salmon, M.R.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

FRIDAY, April 11, 1862.

Eaton, Charles, 41 Chiswell-st, London, Auctioneer. April 8. Sol Turner 68 Aldermanbury, London.
 Gee, William, Heywood, Lancashire, Innkeeper. March 20. Sol Anderton, 2 Olivant-st, Bury.
 Sneath, James, Hackthorpe, Westmorland, Innkeeper. April 8. Sol Harrison, Penrith.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, April 11, 1862.

Alcock, George, Tipton, Staffordshire, Draper. March 21. Composition. Reg. April 9.
 Armstrong, Matthew, & Frederick Desmains, 19 Broad-st, Cheapside, London, Merchant. April 7. Assignment. Reg. April 11.
 Badcock, Tom, 68 High-st, Hampstead, Middlesex, Draper. March 14. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Broadhead, Mary, Widow, Charlotte Mary Broadhead, Spinster, & Eliza Howard Broadhead, Spinster, Bradley-lodge, near Huddersfield. March 17. Assignment. Reg. April 10.
 Case, The Rev. George Grainger, Bingley, Yorkshire, Clerk. March 13. Composition. Reg. April 9.
 Clarke, Frederick, J. A., Depford, Kent, Oilman. March 27. Arrangement. Reg. April 9.
 Cochran, William, Cheetham Hill, Lancashire, Draper. March 14. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Crowther, Henry, East Dereham, Norfolk, Bookseller. March 18. Assignment. Reg. April 10.
 Dunn, Robert, Southmolton, Devonshire, Yeoman. March 19. Assignment. Reg. April 10.
 Eathorne, Paul, John Eathorne, & Edwin Eathorne, Helston, Cornwall, Boot and Shoemakers. March 15. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Elkins, Peter Francis, Dudley, and Old Hall, Ware, Hertfordshire, Attorney. April 7. Composition. Reg. April 9.
 Eyr, Charles Alexander, Junction-rd, Kentish Town, Horse Dealer. March 31. Arrangement. Reg. April 7.
 Farrar, Samuel, Harrogate, Tobaccoist. March 13. Conveyance. Reg. April 9.
 Fraser, John, Catherine-st, Salisbury, Wilts, Draper. March 13. Assignment. Reg. April 7.

Goodingham, Henry Brimble, Cinderford, Gloucestershire, Plumber and Glazier. March 11. Assignment. Reg. April 8.
 Hawkins, William, Barrs-st, Bristol, Timber Dealer. March 24. Conveyance. Reg. April 9.
 Hayward, Robert, Portsmouth and Southsea, Miller and Grocer. March 13. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Hellier, James Bladde, Bristol, Drysalter. March 15. Conveyance. Reg. April 9.
 Huil, Henry, Whittlesea, Cambridgeshire, Linen Draper. March 14. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Johnson, William Hannal, Church-st, Blackburn; Clothier. March 19. Conveyance. Reg. April 9.
 Lucas, Edward, Roe Barn, Eccleshall, Staffordshire, Farmer. March 21. Conveyance. Reg. April 8.
 Muir, Joseph, Liverpool, Draper. March 21. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Newman, James, Carver-st, Birmingham, Jeweller. March 29. Assignment. Reg. April 7.
 O'Connor, James, High-street, Sunderland, Toy Warehouseman. March 14. Composition. Reg. April 9.
 Salmon, James, Aspley, Eccleshall, Staffordshire, Farmer. March 10. Assignment. Reg. April 7.
 Shaw, William, Sheffield and Masbrough, Yorkshire. March 13. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Shrubbs, Walter Frederick, 3 Russell-st, Reading, Corn Factor. March 19. Composition. Reg. April 10.
 Siddall, George, Ashton-rd, Openshaw, Lancashire, Grocer. March 15. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Spyer, John, Devonshire-st, Bishopsgate-st, London, Merchant. March 26. Composition. Reg. April 7.
 Stewart, John, Bedford, Lancashire, Boiler Maker. March 29. Composition. Reg. April 7.
 Sutton, Henry, Upper North-pale, Gray's-inn-rd, Middlesex, Earthenware Dealer. March 25. Assignment. Reg. April 10.
 Tuer, Thomas, West Rainton, Durham, Licensed Victualler. March 29. Assignment. Reg. April 9.
 Webb, Bloomfield, 4 Windsor-pl, Old Kent-rd, Surrey, Choicemonger. March 14. Composition. Reg. April 5.
 White, John, and William Grayburn, Leeds, Cloth Merchants. March 13. Composition. Reg. April 8.
 Windsor, Thomas, Palace-st, Carnarvon, Innkeeper. March 13. Assignment. Reg. April 9.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1862.

Ablart, Thomas, Newport, Monmouthshire, Grocer and Provision Dealer. March 17. Assignment. Reg. April 11.
 Bacon, Joseph, Atherstone, Warwickshire, Draper. March 29. Assignment. Reg. April 11.
 Barnett, John Wollaston, Market Drayton, Salop, Saddler. April 2. Composition. Reg. April 12.
 Bell, James, & Joel Bell, Manchester, Lancashire, Silk Manufacturer. April 11. Composition. Reg. April 14.
 Bentley, Thomas, Chorley, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. April 8. Assignment. Reg. April 12.
 Chennell, Frederick Augustus, & Henry James Motes, 88 Leadenhall-st, London, Leather Merchants. April 9. Composition. Reg. April 14.
 Byers, James, Dowlais, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorganshire, Clothier and Draper. April 7. Composition. Reg. April 11.
 Chichester, George Augustus Hamilton, 6 Neville-terrace, Brompton, Middlesex, Clerk of the Peace for the county of Antrim. April 10. Composition. Reg. April 12.
 Cot, Edgar, Weymouth, Dorsetshire, Gilder. April 1. Composition. Reg. April 15.
 Dix, William Thomas, 372 High-st, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, Tailor and Draper. March 22. Arrangement. Reg. April 11.
 Elliott, Joseph, 85 Bridge-rd, Lambeth, Surrey, Coach Builders. March 19. Assignment. Reg. April 11.
 Flowers, Joseph, 150 Edgeware-rd, Middlesex, Linendraper. March 21. Assignment. Reg. April 12.
 Galloway, Matthew, Fulneck, Leeds, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. March 18. Conveyance. Reg. April 12.
 Gee, William, Heywood, Lancashire, Innkeeper. March 20. Assignment. Reg. April 11.
 Hainsworth, Joseph, & Joshua Rawsley, Rodley, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturers. April 10. Conveyance. Reg. April 14.
 Hetherington, Thomas, & John Hetherington, Bradford, Yorkshire, Currier and Flour Merchants. March 28. Composition. Reg. April 14.
 Hoof, Alfred, Orvington-rd, Brompton, Kent. April 12. Arrangement. Reg. April 15.
 Holdsworth, William Jackson Sutton, 14 Elleryby-lane, Leeds, Yorkshire, Draper. March 25. Assignment. Reg. April 14.
 Jackson, William Maurice, & John Hall Jackson, Manchester, Lead Merchants. April 5. Composition. Reg. April 11.
 Jackson, Thomas, Eotherham, Yorkshire, Furniture Dealer. April 8. Assignment. Reg. April 14.
 Johns, Thomas, Blacktortington, Devonshire, Farmer. March 24. Conveyance. Reg. April 14.
 Kemp, Charles, Brookfield, Norfolk, Bricklayer and Builder. April 1. Assignment. Reg. April 12.
 Levy, Simon, Hayes-st, Manchester, Lancashire, Cap Manufacturer. April 9. Composition. Reg. April 14.
 Lovell, Edward Bourne, Bricklayers, Sussex, and Lincoln's-inn, Middlesex, Barrister. April 10. Composition. Reg. April 11.
 Nabb, William, Harnham, Wilts, Innkeeper. March 18. Conveyance. Reg. April 14.
 Parsons, Thomas, 25 King-st, Manchester, Lancashire, Silk Mercer. April 4. Assignment. Reg. April 14.
 Richardson, Charles Richard, Stoke-upon-Trent, Staffordshire, Innkeeper. March 29. Assignment. Reg. April 12.
 Rigby, John, Preston, Lancashire, Shopkeeper. April 1. Assignment. Reg. April 14.
 Riggott, John, & John Wright, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, Tailors and Drapers. March 28. Assignment. Reg. April 11.
 Shillito, James Wright, Duck's-foot-lane, Wholesale Grocer. April 1. Conveyance. Reg. April 11.
 Showell, Thomas, 10 Palmer-ter, Holloway, Middlesex, Secretary to a Mining Company. March 27. Composition. Reg. April 12.
 Shute, John Coleman, Bath-rd, Birmingham, Warwickshire, Theatrical Manager. April 14. Composition. Reg. April 15.

Turner, Thomas Allen, Birmingham, Leather Seller. March 15. Com-
position. Reg April 11.
Vale, John, Wornbourn, Staffordshire, Maltster and Market Gardener.
March 20. Composition. Reg April 14.
Wake, Thomas, Silverstone, Northamptonshire, Baker. April 8. As-
signment. Reg April 10.
Winscom, Edwin, Carisbrooke, Newport, Isle of Wight, Grocer and Tea
Dealer. April 8. Assignment. Reg April 15.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, April 11, 1862.

Andrews, Robert Stoneley, Farnborough, Schoolmaster. Pet April 7.
Banbury, April 21 at 12. Sol Palmer, Upwell.
Appley, Thomas, & Ephraim Willsher, 13 Addle-st, Wood-st, London,
General Warehousemen. Pet April 7. London, April 25 at 2. Sol
Hare, 8 Old Jewry.
Aynsley, Henry, 26 Bedford-st, North Shields, Licensed Victualler. Pet
April 7. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, April 23 at 12. Sols Tinley & Adam-
son, North Shields.
Balshaw, William, 7 and 9 Watmough-st, Everton, Liverpool, Builder.
Pet April 8. Liverpool, April 23 at 12. Sols Aspinall & Bird, Liverpool.
Banks, Samuel, 3 Regent-grove, Leamington-priors, Veterinary Surgeon.
Pet April 5. Market Harborough, May 6 at 12. Sol Douglas, Market
Harborough.
Benstead, William, Lakes End, Upwell, Norfolk, Blacksmith. Pet April 8.
Winch, April 29 at 12. Sol Palmer, Upwell.
Blakey, Thomas Henry, 38 Moscar-st, Bradford, Warehousemen. Pet
April 8. Bradford, April 30 at 10.30. Sol Hare, Bradford.
Brown, Robert, Gateshead Low Fell, Durham, Florist and Seedsman.
Pet April 7. Gateshead, April 26 at 11. Sol Brignall, Durham.
Cane, James Charles, 19 Edwards-st, Kensington, Clerk to a Public
Company. Pet April 9. London, April 30 at 11. Sol Zimmermann, 5
Claremont-sq.
Caulton, Samuel, Middle-pavement, Nottingham, Commission Agent.
Pet April 7. Nottingham, May 7 at 10. Sol Smith, Nottingham.
Chalton, William, South Transmere, Cheshire, Provision Dealer. Pet
April 9. Liverpool, April 24 at 12. Sol Massey, Chester.
Clarke, William Thomas, 34½ Elliott's-row, St. George's-row, Southwark,
Timber Dealer. Pet April 1 (in form pauperis). London, April 23 at
11.30. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.
Cooper, Thomas, Camden-st, Birmingham, General Grinder. Pet April
7. Birmingham, May 5 at 10. Sol Duke, Birmingham.
Coombs, Thomas, Kensington-pl, Bath, Dairyman. Pet April 8. Bristol,
April 28 at 11. Sols Slack & Simmons, Bath, and Abbot & Co, Bristol.
Davies, Henry Arthur, 11 Albert-terrace, London-rd, Southwark, Builder.
Pet April 9. London, April 29 at 11. Sol Maddock, 15 Sergeant's-inn,
Temple.
Dawson, Mary, 36 Robert-st, Hampstead-rd, Middlesex, Widow, Gentle-
woman. Pet April 7. London, April 23 at 3. Sol Buchanan, 13
Basinghall-st.
De Rose, James, 7 Regent's-rd, Rodeswell-rd, Stepney, Middlesex, Gun
Finisher. Pet April 9. London, April 29 at 11. Sols Marshall & Son,
12 Hatton-garden.
Dicey, George Augustus, 1 Dyer's-buildings, Holborn, Middlesex, Plate
Printer. Pet April 7 (in form pauperis). London, April 30 at 11.
Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.
Dinwoodie, Adam, Scorton, Yorkshire, Commission Agent. Pet April 9.
Manchester, April 23 at 11. Sol Richardson, Manchester.
Duggins, George, Little Heath, Foleshill, Warwickshire, Blacksmith.
Pet April 8. Coventry, April 29 at 3. Sol Griffin, Leamington.
Eardley, William, Bridge-st, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Butcher. Pet
April 10. Newcastle-under-Lyme, April 25 at 10. Sol Litchfield,
Newcastle-under-Lyme.
Elisha, James, 6 Langton-st, St. Lukes, Middlesex, Coach Maker. Pet
April 7 (in form pauperis). London, April 29 at 11. Sols Aldridge &
Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.
Eldon, Henry, Sunderland, Provision Dealer. Pet April 7. Newcastle-
upon-Tyne, April 23 at 11.30. Sols Hare & Co, 20 Southampton-
buildings, London, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Evans, Arthur, Wednesbury, Staffordshire, Carrier. Pet April 8. Bir-
mingham, April 28 at 12. Sol Duignan, Walsall.
Fencecock, Bowland, Southampton, Lessee of Baths. Pet April 7. London,
April 29 at 12.30. Sols Paterson & Son, Bouverie-st, London, for
Mackey, Southampton.
Firby, Christopher, Leeds. Pet April 4. Leeds, April 24 at 11. Sols
Upton & Yewdall, Leeds.
Fitzgerald, John, 16 Richmond-st, Brighton, Marine Store Dealer. Pet
April 8. London, April 29 at 11.30. Sol Dobson, 1 James-st, Adelphi,
London.
Ford, Samuel, Sheffield, Joiner. Pet April 5. Leeds, May 3 at 10. Sol
Mason, York.
Frost, James, Commercial-rd, St. Mary Church, Devonshire, Baker.
Pet April 9. Newton Abbot, April 22 at 11. Sol Carter, Torquay.
Gauntlett, George Frederick, 30 St Mary-st, Portsmouth, Tailor. Pet
April 7. Portsmouth, April 22 at 11.30. Sol Cousins, Junr, Portsea.
Gent, George, 20 Baker-st, Portman-sq, Middlesex, Wine and Spirit Agent.
Pet April 8. London, April 29 at 1.30. Sols Nichols & Clark, 9 Cook's-
court, Lincoln's-inn.
Gerdes, Johann Friedrich Ferdinand, 9 Sparrow-corner, Minorities, London,
Foreign Shipping Agent. Pet April 7. London, April 29 at 10. Sol
Davies, 9 Union-court, Old Broad-st.
Glover, Alem, Barracks-cottages, South Berstead, near Bognor, Sussex.
Pet April 7. Chichester, April 24 at 11. Sol Goodman, Brighton.
Gopall, Charles, Stratford-upon-Avon, Tailor. Pet April 9. Stratford-
upon-Avon, April 23 at 10. Sol Lane, Stratford-upon-Avon.
Gould, George, 28 George-st, Sloane-sq, Chelsea, Middlesex, Carpenter.
Pet April 7. London, April 29 at 3. Sol Doughty, 10 Rochester-ter,
Westminster.
Green, George, Junr, Ivy-st, Southsea, Pastry Cook. Pet April 7. Ports-
mouth, April 23 at 11. Sol Paffard, Portsea.
Green, Thomas Bowyer, 4 St. Margaret's-st, Canterbury, Law Stationer.
Pet April 5. Canterbury, April 24 at 2. Sol De Lassau, Canterbury.
Griffiths, Evan, Maesteg, Llanugonid, Glamorgan-shire, Grocer. Pet
Feb 7. Bridgend, April 15 at 11. Sol Owen, Cardiff.
Haines, Thomas, Ringstead, Northamptonshire, Cornfactor. Pet April 9.
London, April 29 at 11. Sols Wright & Bonner, 15 London-st, Fen-
church-st, for Law, Stamford.

Hall, Thomas, 28 Wellington-st, Sheffield, Spring Knife Manufacturer.
Pet April 8. Sheffield, April 30 at 2. Sol Broadbent, Sheffield.
Hannington, Charles Woodbridge, 3 Alderman's-walk, London, General
Merchant. Pet March 28. London, April 29 at 11. Sols Parke &
Collock, 63 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Hartley George, 41 Carey-st, Lincoln's-inn, Middlesex, Boot Maker. Pet
April 7 (in form pauperis). London, April 30 at 11. Sol Aldridge, 46
Moorgate-st.
Heafield, William, Birmingham. Pet April 7. Birmingham, April 28 at
12. Sol Baker, Birmingham.
Heathwaite, James, 139 Church-st, Shoreditch, Middlesex, Potato Sales-
man. Pet April 7. London, April 29 at 10. Sol Richardson, 15 Old
Jewry Chambers.
Hibbert, Thomas, Chesterfield, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet April 7.
Chesterfield, April 30 at 11. Sol Gratton, Chesterfield.
Hopkin, Henry, Castle Donnington, Leicestershire, Boot and Shoe Manu-
facturer. Pet April 4. Loughborough, April 24 at 11. Sol Huish,
Castle Donnington.
Hunt, John, Humber Tavern, Humber-st, Kingston-upon-Hull, Licensed
Victualler. Pet April 7. Kingston-upon-Hull, April 17 at 11. Sol
Vollans, Hull.
Hunt, James Edward, 61 Grundy-st, Poplar, Middlesex, Grocer. Pet
April 7. London, April 29 at 10. Sol Feverley, 19 Coleman-st.
Hunter, Andrew, Sudbury, Suffolk, Grocer. Pet April 5. London, April
29 at 1. Sols Madox & Wyatt, 30 Clement's-lane, and Halstead.
Jenkinson, Thomas, Denton, near Manchester, Journeyman Hatter. Pet
April 1. Manchester, April 26 at 11. Sol Gardner, Manchester.
Johnson, William, 37 Mercer-st, Shadwell, Dealer in Old Stores. Pet
April 7. London, April 29 at 12.30. Sol Spiller, 3 South-pl, Finsbury.
Jones, Francis, Church-st, Brierley Hill, Old Cloth Manufacturer. Pet
April 9. Stourbridge, April 28 at 10. Sol Lowe, Dudley.
Kehoe, Richard, 21 Duke-st, Union-st, Bishopsgate-st, and White's-row,
Spitalfields, Middlesex, Licensed Carman. Pet April 8. London, April
29 at 10. Sol Wyatt, 2 Copthall-buildings.
Kerry, Robert Thomas, St. Edmund's-pl, Wyle Cop, Salop, Hair Dresser.
Pet April 9. Shrewsbury, May 5 at 10. Sol Davies, Shrewsbury.
Kettle, Thomas, 9 Munster-st, Regent's-park, Middlesex, Baker. Pet
April 7. London, April 29 at 1. Sol Leader, 59 Newman-st, Oxford-st.
King, Abel, Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Merchant. Pet April 9. London,
April 29 at 11. Sols Storey, 6 King's-rd, Bedford-row, London, and
Chamberlin, Great Yarmouth.
King, John, Victoria House, Rope-walk, Bristol, Mason. Pet April 10.
Bristol, April 24 at 11. Sol Gooden, Bristol.
Killick, William Cheesman, 2 Grove-hill-rd, Tonbridge Wells, Kent.
Pet April 9. Tonbridge Wells, April 29 at 2. Sol Clippa, Tonbridge
Wells.
Kirby, James, 46 Coupland-st, Greenheys, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Man-
chester, Beer-house Keeper. Pet April 3. Manchester, April 29 at
9.30. Sols Richardson & Hinnell.
Leek, Matthew, Claines, near Worcester, Builder. Pet April 8. Bir-
mingham, April 25 at 12. Sols Wright, Birmingham, and Finch,
Worcester.
Lovell, William, Nottingdale Potteries, Kensington, Labourer. Pet April
8 (in form pauperis). London, April 29 at 2. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moor-
gate-st.
Mattison, William George, Granger-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Railway
Clerk. Pet April 8. London, April 25 at 2.30. Sols Marshall & Son,
12 Hatton-garden.
Middleton, John, George-lane, Plymouth, Bookbinder and Printer. Pet
April 9. Exeter, April 28 at 12.30. Sol Laidmad, Exeter.
Morgan, David, Skybornevid, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorganshire, Con-
tractor. Pet April 9. Bristol, April 24 at 11. Sols H. & F. James
Merthyr, and Brittan & Sons, Bristol.
Murray, William, 10 Jenkinson-st, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester,
Tipe Dresser. Pet April 4. Manchester, April 29 at 9.30. Sol Stiles,
Manchester.
Oldham, Charles, 128 Yorkshire-st, Rochdale, Draper. Pet April 5. Roch-
dale, April 23 at 11. Sol Holland, Rochdale.
Palmer, Thomas, and William Palmer, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Butchers.
Pet April. Newcastle-under-Lyme, April 24 at 10. Sol Litchfield,
Newcastle-under-Lyme.
Payne, Theophilus Charles, Leicester, Watchmaker. Pet April 4. Not-
tingham, April 30 at 11. Sol Stretton, Leicester.
Pether, Mary Ann, 30 Frederick-st, Caledonian-rd, Islington, Middlesex,
Dressmaker. Pet April 7. London, April 29 at 1. Sol Abrahams,
17 Gresham-st.
Pickstock, Eli, Gravel-lane, Wharton, Cheshire, Cabinet Maker. Pet April
7. Northwich, April 22 at 2. Sol Whitworth, Manchester.
Pierce, John, 49 Lower Moss-lane, Hulme, Manchester, Draper. Pet
April 3. Salford, April 19 at 10. Sol Gardner, Manchester.
Pilgrim, Elizabeth, 9 Salisbury-crescent, Walworth, Surrey, Widow. Pet
April 8. London, April 29 at 1.30. Sol Wilkinson, 14 Great Queen-st,
Westminster.
Poole, John, Bridgwater, Horse Dealer. Pet April 4. Bridgwater, April
30 at 10. Sol Barham, Bridgwater.
Powell, John, Spread Eagle, Haunier, Pipton, Breconshire, Licensed
Victualler. Pet April 9. Brecknock, April 24 at 12. Sol Bellamy, Hay.
Price, John, Deal-lane End, Sussex, Moulder in Iron. Pet April 9. Chil-
chester, April 24 at 11. Sol Hamilton, Emsworth, Hants.
Price, Thomas, Star Inn, Marnhill, Monmouthshire, Sheep and Cattle
Deer. Pet April 4. Pontypool, April 30 at 12. Sol Roberts, Usk,
Monmouthshire.
Richardson, John, 3 Cross-st, York-rd, Lambeth, Slate and Stone Mason
Pet April 4. London, April 29 at 1. Sol Bartley, 4 Bartlett's-bldg,
Holborn.
Ricks, William, 19 Bedminster-parade, Bristol, Grocer. Pet April 10.
Bristol, April 24 at 11. Sol Perrin, Bristol.
Rollings, John, East Reach, Taunton, Innkeeper. Pet April 5. Taunton,
April 22 at 12. Sol Trencard, Taunton.
Scott, Thomas, Petty-cury, Cambridge, Grocer. Pet April 8. Lon-
don, April 28 at 2.30. Sols Speechey, 1 New-linn, London, and Dennis,
Cambridge.
Seddon, Charles Henry, 6 The Priory, Kilburn, Middlesex, Clerk to an
Upholsterer. Pet April 10. London, April 30 at 11.30. Sols Lawrance,
Plews, & Boyer.
Shepherd, Jonathan, 37 Thomas-st, Brick-lane, Spitalfields, Middlesex,
Sawyer. Pet April 8 (in form pauperis). London, April 29 at 11.30.
Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

Siddall, Joseph, Stand-lane, Radcliffe, Lancashire, Gingham Manufacturer. Pet April 9. Bury, May 8 at 11. Sol Stiles, Manchester.

Sorby, Elizabeth, Radnor-st, Hulme, Lancashire, Widow. Pet April 9. Manchester, April 29 at 11. Sol Grundy, Manchester.

Spiers, Richard Bennett, Windsor-ter, Northrop, Oxfordshire, Organ Builder. Pet April 9. Banbury, April 29 at 12. Sol Locker, Banbury.

Stanbridge, Thomas John, Radford Eastons, Oxfordshire, Dealer in Artificial Manure. Pet April 9. London, April 29 at 2. Sol Peverley, 19 Coleman-st.

Stanley, Thomas Lyeett, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Grocer. Pet April 9. Newcastle-under-Lyme, April 25 at 10. Sol Dutton.

Stove, David, 3 Claremont-pl, Upper Grange-rd, Bermondsey, Surrey, Shipowner. Pet April 8. London, April 29 at 10. Sols Harrison & Lewis, 6 Old Jewry.

Stevens, Edmund, York-rd, Kennington-rd, Surrey, Surveyor. Pet April 9. London, April 29 at 11. Sols Peck & Downing, 10 Basinghall-st.

Towds, William, Poistead, Suffolk, Farmer and Brewer. Pet April 7. London, April 29 at 1. Sols Cree & Last, 13 Gray's-inn-sq.

Tundley, Hugh, Tunstall, Staffordshire, Grocer. Pet April 7. Birmingham, April 29 at 11. Sols Harding, Tunstall, and Smith, Birmingham.

Walsh, Charles, Westgate-bridge and Kirkgate, Wakefield, Shoemaker. Pet April 7. Wakefield, April 29 at 9. Sol Barratt, Wakefield.

Warburton, George, Ecclehill, Yorkshire, Salesman. Pet April 8. Bradford, April 30 at 10.30. Sol Watson, Bradford.

Ward, James, Newark-upon-Trent, Fishmonger. Pet April 8. Nottingham, April 30 at 11. Sol Ashwell, Nottingham.

Ward, Thomas, 47 Poulton-sq, King's-rd, Chelsea, Middlesex, Commission Agent. Pet April 9 (in forma pauperis). London, April 29 at 12. Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

Warne, William Theophilus, 31 Red Lion-st, Holborn, Middlesex, Furnishing Ironmonger. Pet April 7. London, April 29 at 2. Sol Harcourt, 2 King's-arm-rd.

Watling, George, Shipham, Norfolk, Shoemaker. Pet April 5. East Dereham, April 23 at 11. Sol Wilkin, King's Lynn.

Webb, Christianus Richard, Chacewater, Kenwyn, Cornwall, Mine and Commission Agent. Pet April 8. Exeter, April 24 at 12. Sol Pitts, Exeter.

Webb, Henry John, Bexley-heath, Bexley, Kent, Dealer in Coals. Pet April 9. London, April 30 at 11. Sol Marshall, 12 Hatton-garden.

Webster, Godfrey, Kennedy-st, Manchester, Commission Agent. Pet April 7. Manchester, April 25 at 11. Sols Rowley & Son, Manchester.

Whalley, Henry, Benjamin Barton, David Whalley, & David Whitehead, Blackburn, Cotton Manufacturers. Pet April 7. Manchester, April 23 at 12. Sol Sale, Manchester.

Wilkinson, Thomas, 14 New-st, Hulme, Manchester, Butcher. Pet April 8. Salford, April 22 at 12. Sol Gardner, Manchester.

Wimbush, John Neal, Birmingham, Grocer. Pet April 10. Birmingham, April 25 at 11. Sols Powell & Son, Birmingham.

Winstor, William, Commercial-rd, Exeter, Baker. Pet April 8. Exeter, April 23 at 11. Sol Friend, Exeter.

Williams, Henry, 2 Friar's-entry, Oxford, Shoemaker. Pet April 8. Oxford, May 2 at 10. Sol Thompson, Oxford.

Williams, John William, Fwllhel, Carnarvonshire, Draper. Pet April 7. Liverpool, April 23 at 11. Sols William, Carnarvon, and Evans, Son, & Sandys, Liverpool.

Wills, Edward Distin, Ford, Stoke Damerel, Devonshire, Grocer. Pet April 7. Exeter, April 28 at 12.30. Sols Fowler, Plymouth, and Hirtzel, Exeter.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1862.

Aspinall, William, 27 Regent-st, Sheffield, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet (in forma pauperis). Sheffield, April 30 at 2. Sol Mason, Sheffield.

Baker, Henry, Truett, Colindale-st, Woolwich, Coal Merchant. Pet April 14. London, May 1 at 11. Sol Hughes, 148 High-st, Woolwich.

Baker, Samuel, Dindley, Draper. Pet April 12. Birmingham, May 2 at 11. Sols James & Knight, Birmingham.

Barnett, Judah, 354 Lower Whitecross-st, London, Journeyman Furrier. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 10. Sol Buchanan, 13 Basinghall-st.

Bell, Richard, 290 Summer-lane, Birmingham, Furniture Broker. Pet April 11. Birmingham, May 5 at 10. Sol East, Birmingham.

Bethe, Justus, 224 Bush-lane, London, Oil Refiner. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 2.30. Sol Hill, 10 Basinghall-st.

Bingham, Robert, 28 Sheep-st, Northampton, Hairdresser. Pet April 11. Northampton, April 26 at 10. Sols Shield & White, Northampton.

Bohn, Lydia Marina, 47 Stanhope-st, Regent's Park, Middlesex, Spinster. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 2. Sol Buchanan, 13 Basinghall-st.

Bray, John, Petherwyn-gate, Northpetherwyn, Devonshire, Innkeeper. Pet April 10. Launceston, April 25 at 11. Sol Peter, Launceston.

Brown, Francis, Clarence-road, Great Yarmouth, Fish Merchant. Pet April 14. London, April 30 at 12. Sols Lawrence, Pews, & Boyer, Old Jewry.

Bullock, Frederick, King's Lynn, Beer-shop Keeper. Pet April 9. King's Lynn, April 28 at 11. Sol Wilkin, King's Lynn.

Burrow, James, Truett, Colindale-st, Woolwich, Beerseller. Pet March 27. Salford, April 26 at 10. Sol Gardner, Manchester.

Calah, Stephen, Shelton's-yard, Trinity-st, Nottingham, Journeyman Butcher. Pet April 10. Nottingham, May 7 at 10. Sol Wood, Nottingham.

Charlton, John, Haydonbridge, Northumberland, Railway Station Master. Pet April 10. Hexham, May 1 at 11. Sol Taylor, Hexham.

Chirwing, Edward, 10 Marine-terrace, Penzance, Cornwall, General Dealer. Pet April 10. Penzance, April 26 at 3. Sol Boyens, Penzance.

Cohen, Simon, 127 Park-lane, Liverpool, Smallware Dealer. Pet April 8. Liverpool, April 26 at 11. Sol Samuel, Liverpool.

Cooke, Mark, Crown Point, Denton, Lancashire, Builder. Pet April 9. Hyde, April 30 at 12. Sol Swan, Manchester.

Compton, Christopher, Ketton, Rutlandshire, Beer-house Keeper. Pet March 31. Stamford, April 21 at 11. Sol Laxton, Stamford.

Cronk, Charles, 2 King-st, Troy Town, Rochester, Carpenter. Pet April 8. Rochester, April 22 at 2. Sol Morgan, Maidstone.

Crosdale, John, Firgrove, Rochdale, Carrier. Pet April 10. Rochdale, April 28 at 11. Sols J. & H. Standing, Rochdale.

Duke, William, Newark-upon-Trent, Builder. Pet April 11. Newark, April 30 at 11. Sol Ashley, Newark-upon-Trent.

Dunks, James, 24 Brydges-st, Covent-garden, Coffee-house Keeper. Pet April 9 (in forma pauperis). London, April 29 at 12.30. Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

Edwards, Charles, 22 Gray's-inn-lane, Middlesex, Baker. Pet April 10. London, April 30 at 12. Sol Begole, 33 Essex-st, Strand.

Evans, Francis Kirby, 1 Ann-st, Waterloo-road, Lambeth, Surrey, Licensed Victualer. Pet April 12. London, April 29 at 12. Sol Hare, 8 Old Jewry.

Farney, George Marlow, 23 Corn Exchange-st, Cambridge, Attorney's Clerk. Pet April 4. Cambridge, April 19 at 10. Sols Whitehead & French.

Fletcher, Richard, 79 Titchbarn-st, Liverpool, Plumber. Pet April 10. Liverpool, April 28 at 3. Sol Roby, Liverpool.

Foreman, Henry, 42 Gunn-st, Blackfriars-rd, Surrey, Horse Dealer. Pet April 10 (in forma pauperis). London, April 29 at 12. Sols Aldridge & Bromley, 46 Moorgate-st.

Fox, Henry, 20 St. James's-ter, Clarendon-rd, Notting-hill, Middlesex, Messenger in the House of Peers. Pet April 11. London, April 29 at 10. Sol Munday, 5 Fountain-ct, Strand.

Fryer, James William, 4 Cleveland-ter, Gloucester-rd, Islington, Middlesex, Commercial Traveller. Pet April 14. London, April 30 at 1. Sol Adcock, 3 Copthall-bldgs.

Gaine, William Edward, 36 Albert-st, Regent's-pk, Civil Engineer. Pet April 8. London, April 29 at 12. Sols Linklater & Hackwood.

Goodday, Edward William, 3 Verulam-bldgs, Gray's-inn, Middlesex, Attorney-at-Law. Pet April 8. London, May 3 at 11. Sol Doyle, 2 Verulam-bldgs, Gray's-inn.

Green, William, White Cross-yd, Briggate, Leeds, Shoemaker. Pet April 11. Leeds, May 1 at 12. Sol Harle, Leeds.

Hammont, Edward, 23 Castle-st, Hastings, Shoemaker. Pet April 5. Hastings, April 25 at 11. Sol Meadows, Hastings.

Harper, George, 36 Clipstone-st, Fitzroy-sq, Middlesex. Pet April 9 (in forma pauperis). London, April 30 at 11.30. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.

Hatfield, William, 28 Piggoit-st, East India-rd, Poplar, Licensed Victualer. Pet April 8. London, April 29 at 3. Sol Rae, 9 Mincing-lane.

Holmes, George, Stone, Staffordshire, Provision Dealer. Pet April 10. Stone, April 25 at 10. Sol Litchfield, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Howard, Thomas, Little Walsingham, Norfolk, Baker. Pet April 8. Little Walsingham, April 28 at 11. Sol Drake, East Dereham.

Hill, Henry Augustus, 7 Canonbury-cottages, Canonbury, Middlesex, Merchant's Clerk. Pet April 9. London, May 3 at 11. Sol Brandon, 15 Essex-st, Strand.

Hill, Samuel, Albert-rd, Aston-pk, Birmingham, Pattern Repairer. Pet April 10. Birmingham, May 3 at 10. Sol East, Birmingham.

Jack, James, 99 Prince's-rd, Bermondsey, Surrey, Porter in Somerset-House. Pet April 8 (in forma pauperis). London, April 30 at 11.30. Sol Aldridge, 46 Moorgate-st.

Jackson, Joseph, Fallsworth, near Manchester, Provision Dealer. Pet April 11. Manchester, April 25 at 12. Sol Gardner, Manchester.

Jebb, John, Bourn, Lincolnshire, Plumber. Pet April 7. Bourn, April 22 at 12. Sol Law, Stamford.

Jewry, John, and Henry George Jewry, 28 College-green, Bristol, Boot and Shoe Manufacturers. Pet April 12. Bristol, April 28 at 11. Sols Miller, Bristol, and Nalder, Bristol.

Johnston, Allan, Hightown, Bristol, Yorkshire, Commission Agent. Pet April 11. Leeds, April 26 at 11. Sol Simpson, Leeds.

Jones, John, Barnt Tree, Tipton, Staffordshire, Limestone Miner. Pet April 10. Dudley, April 26 at 11. Sol Warrington, Dudley.

Joyson, Robert William, Chapelfield-rd, Ardwick, Manchester, Miller. Pet April 8. Manchester, April 26 at 9.30. Sol Gardner, Manchester.

Judd, James, and Henry Alexander Glass, 33a, New Bridge-st, Blackfriars, London, Printers. Pet April 12. Bristol, May 3 at 11. Sol Spicer, 5 Staple-inn, London.

Kemp, Thomas, Great Oxford-st, Norwich, Saddler. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 11.30. Sols Doyle, 2 Verulam-buildings, Gray's-inn, and Sadd, Norwich.

Knopp, John Henry, 14 Moorgate-st, Commercial-rd, East, Middlesex, Journeyman Sugar Baker. Pet April 19. London, April 29 at 2.30. Sol Stoddart, 21 Arbours-st, East, Stepney.

Landown, Edward, Bath, Private Teacher. April 9. Bristol, April 28 at 11. Sol Britton, Bristol.

Lees, Ralph, Sneyd-st, Tunstall, Staffordshire. Pet April 10. Holywell, April 30 at 12. Sol Harding, Tunstall.

Linscott, Thomas, Station-rd, Newton Abbot, Devonshire, Blacksmith. Pet April 11. Newton Abbot, April 28 at 11. Sol Michelmore, Newton Abbot.

Lowe, James, Warrington, Butcher. Pet April 9. Warrington, May 1 at 2. Sol Bent, Warrington.

Lownd, Edward, Bloxwich, Staffordshire, Boat Unloader. Pet. Walsall, April 25 at 10. Sol Ebsworth, Wednesbury.

Marshall, Walter Beckford, 30 Tudeley-st, Islington, Middlesex, Watch Finisher. Pet April 9. London, May 3 at 12. Sol Chorley, 48a Moorgate-st.

Moore, Frederick George Furlong, 114 Stanley-st, Pimlico, a Lieutenant in the 8th Regiment of Foot. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 12. Sol Munday, 6 Essex-st, Strand.

Munden, Joseph, Slape Mills, Netherbury, Dorsetshire, Flax Spinner. Pet April 11. Exeter, April 25 at 11. Sol Manley, Bridport, or Hirtzel, Exeter.

Needham, Francis, 7 York-rd North, Brighton, Tailor. Pet April 10. Brighton, May 1 at 11. Sol Goodman, Brighton.

Penhorwood, Alexander, Jun, Sutcombe, Devonshire, Farmer. Pet April 2. Holsworthy, April 19 at 11. Sol Bencaft, Barnstaple.

Permain, William Richard Targett, Piazza, Winchester, Grocer. Pet April 11. London, April 30 at 12. Sol Goodwin, 3 King's Bench-walk.

Perry, Frederick Marsh, 13 Upper North-st, Caledonian-rd, Islington, Middlesex, Musician. Pet April 10. London, May 3 at 12. Sols Marshall & Son, 12 Hatton-garden.

Pierce, John, 49 Lower Moss-lane, Hulme, Manchester, Draper. Pet April 8. Salford, April 26 at 10. Sol Gardner, Manchester.

Pike, Richard, 2 Church-st, Shoreditch, Middlesex, Trunk and Packing Case Maker. Pet April 14. London, April 29 at 1. Sol Camp, 13 Paternoster-row.

Pilling, Peregrine, Bagdale, near Rochdale, Innkeeper. Pet April 11. Rochdale, April 29 at 11. Sol Holland, Rochdale.

Potts, William, Broadcist, Devonshire, Market Gardener. Pet April 11. Exeter, April 26 at 11. Sol Willeford, Exeter.

Prothero, Decimus, Swansea, Coal Merchant. Pet March 31. Bristol, April 29 at 11. Sols Williams, Cardiff, and Henderson, Bristol.

Richardson, George, Lazenby, Yorkshire, Innkeeper. Pet April 11. Stokesley, April 28 at 12. Sol Simpson, Yarm.

Robins, Charles, Brislington, Somerset, Coachman. April 9. Bristol, April 28 at 11. Sol Brittan, Bristol.

Reeson, William, Shadwell-street, South Shields, Darham, Publican. Pet April 11. Newcastle-upon-Tyne District, April 30 at 11. Sol Lowrey, North Shields.

Rowden, John, and Robert Rowden, Exeter, Carvers and Gilders. Pet April 11. Exeter, April 26 at 11. Sol Champion, Exeter.

Rutzenheffer, John, 16 Warren-street, Sunderland, Provision Dealer. Pet April 8. Sunderland, April 29 at 4. Sol Wright, Sunderland.

Shepherd, James, Burcott, Berton, Buckinghamshire, Labourer. Pet April 9. Aylesbury, April 25 at 10. Sol Horwood, Aylesbury.

Spafford, William, Jewett-street, Bradford, Wheelwright. Pet April 11. Bradford, April 30 at 10.30. Sol Hutchinson, Bradford.

Steward, Edward, 8 Broad-st, King's Lynn, Butcher. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 11. Sols Doyle, 2 Verulam-buildings, Gray's-inn, for Wilkin, Lynn.

Stewart, John, Ashton-under-Lyne, Licensed Victualler. Pet March 29. Manchester, April 26 at 11. Sol Toy, Ashton-under-Lyne.

Sutcliffe, Robert, 6 Swinton-street, Gray's-inn-road, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet April 9. London, May 3 at 11. Sol French, 51 Crutched-friars, London.

Taylor, John, Fritchley, Crich, Derbyshire, Butcher. Pet April 10. Alfreton, May 8 at 2. Sol Neale, Matlock.

Thorne, Richard Samuel, 33 Southampton-terrace, Waterloo Bridge, Surrey, Theatrical Manager. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 3. Sol Phillips, 10 Old Jewry-chambers.

Turner, Frederick John, Lower Peasecod-street, New Windsor, Berkshire, Milkman. Pet April 10. Windsor, April 25 at 11. Sol Vowles, Windsor.

Twedy, Jane, 120 Marine-parade, Brighton, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet April 9. London, April 30 at 11. Sol Goodman, Brighton.

Williams, Thomas, 4 Kennington-place, Lambeth, Surrey, Commission Agent. Pet April 10. London, April 29 at 12. Sol Howell, Bow-lane, London.

Williams, William Henry, 4 Vincent-pl, Kingsland-rd., Middlesex, General Commission Agent. Pet April 12. London, April 29 at 1. Sol Beard, 10 Basinghall-st.

Williams, John Lewis, Llanrobey, Carmarthenshire, Horse Dealer. Pet April 11. Bristol, May 1 at 11. Sols Clifton & Benson, Bristol.

Wood, Richard, Stanley-cum-Wrenthorpe, Wakefield, Innkeeper. Pet April 11. Wakefield, April 29 at 3. Sol Gill, Wakefield.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, April 11, 1862.

Bastable, Elisha, Belgrave House, Landport, Hampshire, Wholesale Baker. April 4.

On the 30th of April, in 1 vol., large 8vo., price 35s., the Fifth Edition of **THE LAW OF CONTRACTS.** By C. G. ADDISON, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, author of *The Law of Torts*.

London: V. & R. STEVENS, SONS, & HAYNES, 26, Bell-yard, Lincoln's-inn.

Now ready, price 2s.

THE LAW OF TRADE MARKS, with some account of its History and Development in the Decisions of the Courts of Law and Equity. By EDWARD LLOYD, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law, London.

WILLIAM DRAPER, 59, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

LANDOWNERS AND THE LORD CHANCELLOR'S TRANSFER BILL.

Now ready, price 2s.,

OBSERVATIONS UPON THE LORD CHANCELLOR'S BILL relating to Land Transfer and Registration of Title to Land. Being an epitome of the measure prepared as much for perusal by landowners as by lawyers. By RUPERT POTTER, B.A., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. To which is appended a copy of the Bill.

London: W. DRAPER, 59, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn.

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1861.

COMPENDIUM OF DECISIONS UNDER THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1861.—No 53 of the GAZETTE of BANKRUPTCY, on April 13rd, will contain a complete Compendium of the Decisions of the several Courts upon the Construction of the New Act. Prepared by J. C. BROUGH, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Price 2d. Every Wednesday and Saturday. Three Months, free by post, 6s. 6d.

Chief Office, 26, Bell-yard, Lincoln's-inn, London, W.C., and District Offices.

Now ready,

BEETON'S ILLUMINATED FAMILY BIBLE Part I., 2s., with Illustrations by Bendemann, Overbeck, Rethel, Schnow, &c. The Ornamentation by Noel Humphreys. A Specimen Part sent Post Free for 24 Stamps.

London: S. O. BEETON, 248, Strand, W.C.; and all Booksellers.

THE QUEEN, a new Journal and Review. 6d. Weekly. Prospectus now ready. London, 248, Strand, W.C.

CONSULTING ENGINEER.—JOHN IMRAY, M.A., author of a Treatise on Practical Mechanics and the Steam Engine. Advice on Patents, Inspection and Valuation of Machinery, Arrangements, &c.

Address, 64, Bridge-road, Lambeth, S.

MR. W. V. GRIFFITHS, Accountant and Auditor, HAS REMOVED from 36 Basinghall-street to No. 31 KING STREET, E.C.

THE "LONDON GAZETTE," and LONDON COUNTRY, COLONIAL, and FOREIGN ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE,

No. 5, CHANCERY-LANE.

HENRY GREEN (for many years with the late George Reynell) begs to remind the Legal Profession that all advertisements entrusted to his care will meet with that careful and prompt attention which an experience of upwards of eighteen years in the insertion of *pro forma* and other legal notices, &c., convinces him is so essential.

Public Companies' Announcements, Election Addresses, &c. immediately considered. N.B. One copy only of advertisement required.

JOHN GOSNELL & CO., PERFUMERS TO THE QUEEN, beg to recommend the following Fashionable and Superior Articles for the TOILET to the especial notice of all purchasers of Choice PERFUMERY.

John Gosnell & Co.'s JOCKEY CLUB PERFUME, in universal request as the most admired perfume for the handkerchief, price 2s. 6d.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE PERFUME—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GARIBALDI BOUQUET—a most choice and fashionable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s RUSSIAN LEATHER PERFUME—a very fashionable and agreeable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s BALL-ROOM COMPANION or FOUNTAIN PERFUMES. Elegant Novelties, in the form of Portable Handkerchief Perfumes in a neat case, which emits on pressure a jet of most refreshing perfume. Price 1s. and 1s. 6d. each.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE POMADE—elegantly perfumed, and highly recommended for beautifying and promoting the growth of Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GOLDEN OIL—Molline—Macassar Oil—Bears Grease, &c., for the Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE is greatly superior to any Tooth Powder, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, protects the enamel from decay, and imparts a pleasing fragrance to the breath.

John Gosnell & Co.'s AMBROSIAL SHAVING CREAM, 1s. and 1s. 6d. n pots; also, in compressible tubes, for the convenience of persons travelling, price 1s.

John Gosnell and Co.'s INSTANTANEOUS HAIR DYE—The only Hair Dye which produces a good natural colour with perfect certainty, and with the least possible trouble.

Manufactory, 12, Three King-court, Lombard-street, London.

COAL.—The GUINEA COAL COMPANY'S WALLENDS all the year round, can only be obtained by addressing to the Secretary, MR. JAMES JENNINGS, 7, York-road, King's-cross Station, N. Coke, 10s.

KAMPTULICON OR ELASTIC FLOOR COIL, as made by GOUGH & BOYCE, the Original Patentees, and laid exclusively by them at the Houses of Parliament, and numerous other Public Offices. It is especially adapted for Churches, Mansions, Public Rooms, Shops, and Passages, being clean, warm, noiseless, dry, and economical.

GOUGH & BOYCE, 12, Bush-lane, Cannon-street, London. Forwarded to all parts of the Country.

A WONDERFUL LIGHT.—The most brilliant and economical artificial light known is obtained from the STELLA LAMP. No smoke! No smoke! No danger! During 12 consecutive hours the cost from one penny. The secret of success arises from perfect combustion. If you do not use gas, by all means put away candles, and adopt the STELLA LAMP. Price 1s. 3d. to 3 guineas; office lamps from 2s. 6d.

Depot, No 11, Oxford-street, adjoining the Star Brewery.

NOTICE TO FAMILIES.—Messrs. TAYLOR beg to submit their list of prices for the best articles. Cheese of the finest quality, per lb., viz., American, 6d. to 7d.; Cheshire 7d. to 9d.; Cheddar, 7d. to 9d.; Rippe Stilton, 1s.; Gruyere, 8d.; Parmesan, 1s. 4d.; Wiltshire Bacon (by the side or half) 8d.; Best Salt Butter, 10d. to 1s. 2d.; fresh ditto, 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d. York Hams, 6d. to 8d.; choice ditto from 8lbs. to 20lbs., 9d. Ox Tongues, 3s. to 3s. 6d. each. Young Fowls, 2s. to 2s. 6d. Large Capons, 3s.—W. and J. C. Taylor, 35, Little Pulteney-street, Golden-square, W.

Families waited upon for orders daily.

TYLER AND COMPANY, (Late GOODCHAP, TYLER, & Co.)

ACCOUNTANTS,

13, GRESHAM STREET, E.C.

During a practice of twenty years, T. & Co. have had great experience in winding up joint Stock Companies in Chancery; the investigation of intricate and disputed accounts; the liquidation of estates under deeds of inspection, assignment, and composition; and the audit of the accounts of public companies.

The management of estates under the New Bankruptcy Act undertaken. Terms moderate.

